SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: kevin.waugh@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:53

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Kevin Waugh** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Kevin Waugh

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **kevin.waugh@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Kevin Waugh, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Kevin Waugh, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they

comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other,

then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and

seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities

Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy

back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul

Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and

orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Kevin Waugh, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Kevin Waugh, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance

with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Kevin Waugh, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Kevin Waugh, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Kevin Waugh, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Kevin Waugh, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32

of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Kevin Waugh, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Kevin Waugh, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Kevin Waugh with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: cathay.wagantall@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:53

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Cathay Wagantall** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Cathay Wagantall

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **cathay.wagantall@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Cathay Wagantall, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Cathay Wagantall, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot

support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465

and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997]

1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and

security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this

provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits

discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard

Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on

his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities

laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse

compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the

applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a

nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil

allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Cathay Wagantall, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Cathay Wagantall, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by

financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Cathay Wagantall, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Cathay Wagantall, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Cathay Wagantall, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Cathay Wagantall, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has

taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly

dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or

any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because

there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with

informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Cathay Wagantall, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Cathay Wagantall, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally

against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Cathay Wagantall with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: gary.vidal@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:52

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,

owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Gary Vidal** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Gary Vidal

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **gary.vidal@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Gary Vidal, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Gary Vidal, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his

constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the

prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was

accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating,

obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as

in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and

Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies

outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence

evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of

agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's

consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or

1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new

client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-

Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Gary Vidal, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Gary Vidal, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment

arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions,

omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Gary Vidal, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Gary Vidal, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Gary Vidal, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Gary Vidal, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Gary Vidal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de

facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Gary Vidal, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Gary Vidal with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: rosemarie.falk@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:50

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Rosemarie Falk** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Rosemarie Falk

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **rosemarie.falk@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Rosemarie Falk, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Rosemarie Falk, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosemarie Falk, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosemarie Falk, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosemarie Falk, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosemarie Falk, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosemarie Falk, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosemarie Falk, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Rosemarie Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Rosemarie Falk, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Rosemarie Falk with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: kelly.block@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:49

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Kelly Block** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Kelly Block

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **kelly.block@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Kelly Block, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Kelly Block, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and

that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they

were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this

agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Kelly Block, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the

execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Kelly Block, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and

enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Kelly Block, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Kelly Block, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Kelly Block, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Kelly Block, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Kelly Block, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Kelly Block, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Kelly Block with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: sameer.zuberi@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:49

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Sameer Zuberi** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Sameer Zuberi

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **sameer.zuberi@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Sameer Zuberi, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Sameer Zuberi, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Sameer Zuberi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Sameer Zuberi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon

breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated

restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially

compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Sameer Zuberi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Sameer Zuberi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Sameer Zuberi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Sameer Zuberi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath

to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed

objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Sameer Zuberi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Sameer Zuberi, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Sameer Zuberi with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: nathalie.sinclair-desgagne@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:47

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Nathalie Sinclair** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Nathalie Sinclair

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **nathalie.sinclair-desgagne@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Nathalie Sinclair, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Nathalie Sinclair, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the

functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word

"Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law,

and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under

international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following

fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be

made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed

with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good

standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or

1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the

new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-

Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Nathalie Sinclair, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Nathalie Sinclair, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD

Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful

living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in

writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Nathalie Sinclair, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary

breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Nathalie Sinclair, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Nathalie Sinclair, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Nathalie Sinclair, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to

acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths

of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’;

and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws

into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Nathalie Sinclair, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Nathalie Sinclair, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Nathalie Sinclair with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: mario.simard@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:46

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Mario Simard** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Mario Simard

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **mario.simard@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Mario Simard, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Mario Simard, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private

contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of

the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1

S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the

person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this

provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground

of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard

Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his

inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant", confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the

investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase

transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your

acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD

Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that

the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors.

Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance

requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the

OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Mario Simard, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Mario Simard, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Mario Simard, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Mario Simard, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Mario Simard, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Mario Simard, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Mario Simard, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Mario Simard, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Mario Simard with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: brenda.shanahan@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:46

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Brenda Shanahan** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate

entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Brenda Shanahan

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **brenda.shanahan@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Brenda Shanahan, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Brenda Shanahan, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or

Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon

demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions:

article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section

32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that "Canada's" geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine

its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD

Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors

(Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to

their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client”

information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505;

and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Brenda Shanahan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Brenda Shanahan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not

limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister

and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly

amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Brenda Shanahan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including

misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Brenda Shanahan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Brenda Shanahan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Brenda Shanahan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule

for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Brenda Shanahan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Brenda Shanahan, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Brenda Shanahan with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: yves.perron@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:44

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Yves Perron** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Yves Perron

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **yves.perron@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Yves Perron, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Yves Perron, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper

House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond

the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of

alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of

fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and

financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that

this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and

Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies

outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence

evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of

agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's

consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or

1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the

new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-

Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Yves Perron, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Yves Perron, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or

enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your

actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Yves Perron, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Yves Perron, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Yves Perron, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Yves Perron, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Yves Perron, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Yves Perron, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Yves Perron with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: monique.pauze@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:43

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Monique Pauze** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Monique Pauze

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **monique.pauze@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Monique Pauze, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Monique Pauze, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Monique Pauze, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Monique Pauze, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Monique Pauze, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Monique Pauze, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Monique Pauze, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Monique Pauze, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Monique Pauze, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Monique Pauze, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Monique Pauze with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: pierre.paul-hus@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:43

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Pierre Paul** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Pierre Paul

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **pierre.paul-hus@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Pierre Paul, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Pierre Paul, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and

that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they

were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this

agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierre Paul, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the

execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierre Paul, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and

enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierre Paul, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierre Paul, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierre Paul, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierre Paul, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Pierre Paul, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Pierre Paul, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Pierre Paul with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: richard.lehoux@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:41

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Richard Lehoux** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Richard Lehoux

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **richard.lehoux@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Richard Lehoux, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Richard Lehoux, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik’s.

96. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Richard Lehoux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Richard Lehoux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon

breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated

restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially

compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Richard Lehoux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Richard Lehoux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Richard Lehoux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Richard Lehoux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath

to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed

objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Richard Lehoux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Richard Lehoux, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Richard Lehoux with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: diane.lebouthillier@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:40

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Diane Lebouthillier** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Diane Lebouthillier

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **diane.lebouthillier@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Diane Lebouthillier, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Diane Lebouthillier, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the

functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word

"Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of

law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing

under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am

now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and

Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and

remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario

Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or

appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik’s.

96. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place

yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in

part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Diane Lebouthillier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Diane Lebouthillier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty,

enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Diane Lebouthillier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Diane Lebouthillier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Diane Lebouthillier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Diane Lebouthillier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not

regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in

what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving

my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Diane Lebouthillier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Diane Lebouthillier, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Diane Lebouthillier with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: stephane.lauzon@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:40

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Stephane Lauzon** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Stephane Lauzon

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **stephane.lauzon@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Stephane Lauzon, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Stephane Lauzon, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine

difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of

that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law,

courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by

omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in

law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest

performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and

informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or

woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”,

had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property

owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services

for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling

mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance

approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the

purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there

was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Stephane Lauzon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides

statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Stephane Lauzon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising

from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical

jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Stephane Lauzon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Stephane Lauzon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed

in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Stephane Lauzon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Stephane Lauzon, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the

contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which

the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given.” Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of

Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Stephane Lauzon, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Stephane Lauzon, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Stephane Lauzon with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: joel.godin@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:37

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Joel Godin** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Joel Godin

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **joel.godin@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Joel Godin, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Joel Godin, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of

any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such

laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

"Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW

and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw

to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD

Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share

certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik,

President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase

shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will

result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Joel Godin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Joel Godin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-

performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under

principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses

every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Joel Godin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Joel Godin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Joel Godin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record,

ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Joel Godin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by

the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a ‘natural’ person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships,

associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms

of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Joel Godin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a

man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Joel Godin, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Joel Godin with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: marilene.gill@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:37

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Marilene Gill** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Marilene Gill

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **marilene.gill@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Marilene Gill, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Marilene Gill, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they

comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other,

then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and

seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities

Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy

back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul

Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and

orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Marilene Gill, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Marilene Gill, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance

with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Marilene Gill, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Marilene Gill, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Marilene Gill, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Marilene Gill, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32

of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Marilene Gill, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Marilene Gill, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Marilene Gill with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: bernard.genereux@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:37

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Bernard Genereux** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Bernard Genereux

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **bernard.genereux@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Bernard Genereux, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Bernard Genereux, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot

support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465

and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997]

1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and

security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In

accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American

Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard

Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on

his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities

laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse

compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the

applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a

nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil

allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Bernard Genereux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Bernard Genereux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by

financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Bernard Genereux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Bernard Genereux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Bernard Genereux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Bernard Genereux, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has

taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly

dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or

any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because

there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with

informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Bernard Genereux, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Bernard Genereux, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally

against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Bernard Genereux with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: luc.desilets@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:34

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,

owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Luc Desilets** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Luc Desilets

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **luc.desilets@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Luc Desilets, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Luc Desilets, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and

powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva

Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating,

obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as

in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and

Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies

outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence

evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of

agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's

consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or

1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the

new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-

Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Luc Desilets, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Luc Desilets, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or

enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your

actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Luc Desilets, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Luc Desilets, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Luc Desilets, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Luc Desilets, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Luc Desilets, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Luc Desilets, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Luc Desilets with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: caroline.desbiens@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:34

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Caroline Desbiens** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate

entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Caroline Desbiens

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **caroline.desbiens@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Caroline Desbiens, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Caroline Desbiens, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or

Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon

demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and

comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being

a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that "Canada's" geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the

meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat

currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my

standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful

benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to

target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate

securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse

compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse

directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or

expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares

after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named

to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Caroline Desbiens, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Caroline Desbiens, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity,

and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise

willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any

contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Caroline Desbiens, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Caroline Desbiens, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Caroline Desbiens, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Caroline Desbiens, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by

force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with

informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Caroline Desbiens, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Caroline Desbiens, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally

against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Caroline Desbiens with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: gerard.deltell@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:34

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,

owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Gerard Deltell** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Gerard Deltell

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **gerard.deltell@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Gerard Deltell, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Gerard Deltell, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and

powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva

Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating,

obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as

in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and

Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and

remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence

evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of

agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's

consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or

1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the

new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-

Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Gerard Deltell, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Gerard Deltell, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or

enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your

actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Gerard Deltell, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Gerard Deltell, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Gerard Deltell, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Gerard Deltell, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Gerard Deltell, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Gerard Deltell, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Gerard Deltell with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: yves-francois.blanchet@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:31

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Francois Blanchet** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate

entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Francois Blanchet

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **yves-francois.blanchet@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Francois Blanchet, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Francois Blanchet, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or

Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon

demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions:

article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section

32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that "Canada's" geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine

its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD

Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors

(Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to

their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client”

information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505;

and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Francois Blanchet, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Francois Blanchet, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not

limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister

and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly

amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Francois Blanchet, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including

misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Francois Blanchet, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Francois Blanchet, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Francois Blanchet, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule

for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Francois Blanchet, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Francois Blanchet, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Francois Blanchet with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: marie-claude.bibeau@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:31

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Claude Bibeau** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Claude Bibeau

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **marie-claude.bibeau@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Claude Bibeau, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Claude Bibeau, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper

House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond

the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of

alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of

fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and

financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that

this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and

Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and

remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence

evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of

agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's

consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase

the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified

Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul

Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and

orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Claude Bibeau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Claude Bibeau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance

with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Claude Bibeau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Claude Bibeau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Claude Bibeau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Claude Bibeau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section

32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Claude Bibeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Claude Bibeau, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Claude Bibeau with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: sylvie.berube@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:31

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Sylvie Berube** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Sylvie Berube

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **sylvie.berube@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Sylvie Berube, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Sylvie Berube, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private

contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of

the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1

S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the

person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this

provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground

of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard

Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his

inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant", confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the

investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase

transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your

acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD

Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that

the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors.

Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance

requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the

OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Sylvie Berube, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Sylvie Berube, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Sylvie Berube, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Sylvie Berube, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Sylvie Berube, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Sylvie Berube, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Sylvie Berube, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Sylvie Berube, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Sylvie Berube with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: salma.zahid@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:28

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Salma Zahid** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Salma Zahid

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **salma.zahid@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Salma Zahid, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Salma Zahid, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Salma Zahid, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Salma Zahid, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Salma Zahid, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Salma Zahid, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Salma Zahid, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Salma Zahid, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Salma Zahid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Salma Zahid, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Salma Zahid with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: jean.yip@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:28

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Jean Yip** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Jean Yip

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **jean.yip@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Jean Yip, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Jean Yip, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards,

universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle

of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force

me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by

commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also

affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or

woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had

provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to

remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name],

the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then

needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions

were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was

given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and

profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Jean Yip, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Jean Yip, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with

ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Jean Yip, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Jean Yip, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Jean Yip, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Jean Yip, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32

of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Jean Yip, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Jean Yip, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Jean Yip with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: ryan.williams@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:28

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Ryan Williams** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Ryan Williams

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **ryan.williams@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Ryan Williams, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Ryan Williams, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private

contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of

the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1

S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the

person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this

provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground

of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard

Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on

his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities

laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse

compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the

applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a

nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)”

and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at

TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance

and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and

there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Ryan Williams, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Ryan Williams, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Ryan Williams, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Ryan Williams, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Ryan Williams, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Ryan Williams, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Ryan Williams, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Ryan Williams, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Ryan Williams with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: filomena.tassi@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:25

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Filomena Tassi** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Filomena Tassi

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **filomena.tassi@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Filomena Tassi, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Filomena Tassi, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Filomena Tassi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Filomena Tassi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Filomena Tassi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Filomena Tassi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Filomena Tassi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Filomena Tassi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Filomena Tassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Filomena Tassi, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Filomena Tassi with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: jenna.sudds@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:25

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Jenna Sudds** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Jenna Sudds

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **jenna.sudds@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Jenna Sudds, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Jenna Sudds, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Jenna Sudds, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Jenna Sudds, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Jenna Sudds, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Jenna Sudds, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Jenna Sudds, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Jenna Sudds, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Jenna Sudds, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Jenna Sudds, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Jenna Sudds with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: don.stewart@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:25

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Don Stewart** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Don Stewart

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **don.stewart@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Don Stewart, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Don Stewart, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of

any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such

laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of "Inherent Jurisdiction" that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

"Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW

and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw

to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD

Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share

certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by

instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no

ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-

performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Don Stewart, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Don Stewart, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour,

non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under

principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of

losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Don Stewart, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Don Stewart, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Don Stewart, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record,

ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Don Stewart, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by

the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a ‘natural’ person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships,

associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms

of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Don Stewart, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a

man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Don Stewart, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Don Stewart with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: jamie.schmale@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:22

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Jamie Schmale** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Jamie Schmale

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **jamie.schmale@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Jamie Schmale, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Jamie Schmale, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Jamie Schmale, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Jamie Schmale, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon

breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated

restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially

compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Jamie Schmale, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Jamie Schmale, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Jamie Schmale, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Jamie Schmale, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath

to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed

objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Jamie Schmale, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Jamie Schmale, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Jamie Schmale with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: yaara.saks@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:22

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Yaara Saks** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Yaara Saks

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **yaara.saks@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Yaara Saks, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Yaara Saks, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of

my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word

"Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law,

and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under

international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following

fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be

made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount

of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related

processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario

Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and

"Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD

had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in

accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the "Privet Placement Subscription Form". The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a "SWAP" into the client's account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the "New Client's" RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with "Ontario Securities Act". TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC

Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Yaara Saks, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Yaara Saks, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the

above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Yaara Saks, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Yaara Saks, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Yaara Saks, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Yaara Saks, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Yaara Saks, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de

facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Yaara Saks, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Yaara Saks with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: ruby.sahota@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:22

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Ruby Sahota** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Ruby Sahota

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **ruby.sahota@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Ruby Sahota, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Ruby Sahota, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Ruby Sahota, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Ruby Sahota, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Ruby Sahota, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Ruby Sahota, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Ruby Sahota, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Ruby Sahota, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Ruby Sahota, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Ruby Sahota, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Ruby Sahota with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: mary.ng@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:19

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Mary Ng** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Mary Ng

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **mary.ng@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Mary Ng, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Mary Ng, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards,

universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle

of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force

me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by

commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also

affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or

woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had

provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to

remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name],

the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then

needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions

were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was

given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and

profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Mary Ng, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Mary Ng, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with

ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Mary Ng, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Mary Ng, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Mary Ng, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Mary Ng, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32

of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Mary Ng, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Mary Ng, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Mary Ng with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: john.nater@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:19

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **John Nater** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: John Nater

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **john.nater@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, John Nater, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, John Nater, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private

contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of

the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1

S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the

person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this

provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground

of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik.

The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his

inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the

investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase

transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your

acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD

Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the

company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice

Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and

determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the "Privet Placement Subscription Form". The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a "SWAP" into the client's account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the "New Client's" RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with "Ontario Securities Act". TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik

Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President

of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man John Nater, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man John Nater, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in

this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man John Nater, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man John Nater, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man John Nater, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man John Nater, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by John Nater, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de

facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, John Nater, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, John Nater with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: yasir.naqvi@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:19

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Yasir Naqvi** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Yasir Naqvi

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **yasir.naqvi@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Yasir Naqvi, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Yasir Naqvi, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and

that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they

were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this

agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Yasir Naqvi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the

execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Yasir Naqvi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and

enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Yasir Naqvi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Yasir Naqvi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Yasir Naqvi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Yasir Naqvi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Yasir Naqvi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Yasir Naqvi, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Yasir Naqvi with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: james.maloney@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:16

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **James Maloney** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: James Maloney

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **james.maloney@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, James Maloney, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, James Maloney, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant", confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a "Know Your Client Form" proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares " and the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying "TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor's clients name)".

79. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a "Private Placement Agreement" to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man James Maloney, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man James Maloney, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon

breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated

restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially

compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man James Maloney, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man James Maloney, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man James Maloney, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man James Maloney, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath

to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed

objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by James Maloney, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, James Maloney, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, James Maloney with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: tim.louis@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:16

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Tim Louis** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Tim Louis

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **tim.louis@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Tim Louis, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Tim Louis, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of

my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the

scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the

Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in

the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of

the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part

without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West

Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this

election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read

and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a

defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in

conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to

1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be

provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a

RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a

copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice

Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and

determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the "Privet Placement Subscription Form". The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a "SWAP" into the client's account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the "New Client's" RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with "Ontario Securities Act". TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik

Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President

of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Tim Louis, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Tim Louis, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in

this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Tim Louis, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Tim Louis, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Tim Louis, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Tim Louis, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the

sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Tim Louis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de

facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Tim Louis, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Tim Louis with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: lloyd.longfield@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:15

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Lloyd Longfield** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Lloyd Longfield

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **lloyd.longfield@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Lloyd Longfield, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Lloyd Longfield, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Lloyd Longfield, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Lloyd Longfield, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Lloyd Longfield, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Lloyd Longfield, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Lloyd Longfield, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Lloyd Longfield, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Lloyd Longfield, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Lloyd Longfield, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Lloyd Longfield with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: kamal.khera@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:13

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Kamal Khera** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Kamal Khera

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **kamal.khera@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Kamal Khera, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Kamal Khera, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Kamal Khera, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Kamal Khera, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Kamal Khera, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Kamal Khera, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Kamal Khera, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Kamal Khera, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Kamal Khera, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Kamal Khera, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Kamal Khera with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: arpan.khanna@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:13

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Arpan Khanna** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Arpan Khanna

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **arpan.khanna@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Arpan Khanna, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Arpan Khanna, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or

surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit

such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of "Inherent Jurisdiction" that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

"Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times,

TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on

Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age

of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of

$20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not

currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the

account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement

did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Arpan Khanna, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem,

[2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Arpan Khanna, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and

ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Arpan Khanna, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Arpan Khanna, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Arpan Khanna, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Arpan Khanna, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Arpan Khanna, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Arpan Khanna, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Arpan Khanna with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: iqra.khalid@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:12

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Iqra Khalid** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Iqra Khalid

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **iqra.khalid@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Iqra Khalid, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Iqra Khalid, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they

comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other,

then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and

seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities

Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy

back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and

responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Iqra Khalid, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Iqra Khalid, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment

arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions,

omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Iqra Khalid, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Iqra Khalid, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Iqra Khalid, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Iqra Khalid, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Iqra Khalid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de

facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Iqra Khalid, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Iqra Khalid with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: patty.hajdu@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:10

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Patty Hajdu** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Patty Hajdu

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **patty.hajdu@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Patty Hajdu, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Patty Hajdu, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and

that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they

were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this

agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Patty Hajdu, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the

execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Patty Hajdu, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and

enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Patty Hajdu, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Patty Hajdu, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Patty Hajdu, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Patty Hajdu, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Patty Hajdu, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Patty Hajdu, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Patty Hajdu with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: matthew.green@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:09

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Matthew Green** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Matthew Green

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **matthew.green@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Matthew Green, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Matthew Green, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Matthew Green, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Matthew Green, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon

breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated

restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially

compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Matthew Green, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Matthew Green, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Matthew Green, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Matthew Green, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath

to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed

objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Matthew Green, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Matthew Green, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Matthew Green with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: karina.gould@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:09

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Karina Gould** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Karina Gould

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **karina.gould@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Karina Gould, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Karina Gould, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of

my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word

"Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law,

and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under

international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following

fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be

made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount

of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related

processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario

Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)”

and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at

TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance

and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and

there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Karina Gould, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Karina Gould, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Karina Gould, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Karina Gould, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Karina Gould, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Karina Gould, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Karina Gould, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Karina Gould, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Karina Gould with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: nathaniel.erskine-smith@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:07

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Nathaniel Smith** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Nathaniel Smith

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **nathaniel.erskine-smith@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Nathaniel Smith, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Nathaniel Smith, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Nathaniel Smith, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Nathaniel Smith, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Nathaniel Smith, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Nathaniel Smith, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Nathaniel Smith, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Nathaniel Smith, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more

judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Nathaniel Smith, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Nathaniel Smith, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Nathaniel Smith with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: dave.epp@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:06

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Dave Epp** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Dave Epp

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **dave.epp@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Dave Epp, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Dave Epp, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and

that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place

courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to

acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse.

You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the

Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of

Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of

private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they

were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this

agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Dave Epp, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the

execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Dave Epp, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and

enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Dave Epp, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Dave Epp, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Dave Epp, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Dave Epp, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Dave Epp, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Dave Epp, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Dave Epp with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: ali.ehsassi@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:06

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Ali Ehsassi** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Ali Ehsassi

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **ali.ehsassi@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Ali Ehsassi, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Ali Ehsassi, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they

comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other,

then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and

seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities

Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy

back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and

responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Ali Ehsassi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Ali Ehsassi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment

arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions,

omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Ali Ehsassi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Ali Ehsassi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Ali Ehsassi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Ali Ehsassi, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Ali Ehsassi, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de

facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Ali Ehsassi, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Ali Ehsassi with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: michael.coteau@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:03

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Michael Coteau** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Michael Coteau

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **michael.coteau@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Michael Coteau, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Michael Coteau, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Coteau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Coteau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Coteau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Coteau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Coteau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Coteau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more

judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Michael Coteau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Michael Coteau, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Michael Coteau with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: chad.collins@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:03

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Chad Collins** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Chad Collins

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **chad.collins@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Chad Collins, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Chad Collins, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Chad Collins, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Chad Collins, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Chad Collins, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Chad Collins, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Chad Collins, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Chad Collins, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Chad Collins, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Chad Collins, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Chad Collins with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: michael.chong@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:03

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Michael Chong** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Michael Chong

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **michael.chong@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Michael Chong, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Michael Chong, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or

surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit

such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

“Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times,

TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on

Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age

of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of

$20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not

currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the

account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement

did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Chong, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem,

[2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Chong, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and

ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Chong, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Chong, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Chong, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Chong, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Michael Chong, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Michael Chong, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Michael Chong with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: chris.bittle@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:00

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Chris Bittle** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Chris Bittle

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **chris.bittle@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Chris Bittle, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Chris Bittle, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they

comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other,

then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and

seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities

Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy

back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and

responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Chris Bittle, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Chris Bittle, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment

arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions,

omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Chris Bittle, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Chris Bittle, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Chris Bittle, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Chris Bittle, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Chris Bittle, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de

facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Chris Bittle, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Chris Bittle with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: michael.barrett@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:00

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Michael Barrett** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Michael Barrett

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **michael.barrett@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Michael Barrett, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Michael Barrett, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Barrett, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Barrett, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Barrett, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Barrett, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Barrett, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Barrett, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Michael Barrett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Michael Barrett, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Michael Barrett with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: tony.baldinelli@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 24/04/2025 00:00

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Tony Baldinelli** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Tony Baldinelli

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **tony.baldinelli@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Tony Baldinelli, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Tony Baldinelli, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Tony Baldinelli, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Tony Baldinelli, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Tony Baldinelli, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Tony Baldinelli, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Tony Baldinelli, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Tony Baldinelli, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Tony Baldinelli, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Tony Baldinelli, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Tony Baldinelli with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: scott.aitchison@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:57

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Scott Aitchison** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Scott Aitchison

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **scott.aitchison@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Scott Aitchison, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Scott Aitchison, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Scott Aitchison, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Scott Aitchison, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Scott Aitchison, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Scott Aitchison, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Scott Aitchison, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Scott Aitchison, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Scott Aitchison, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Scott Aitchison, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Scott Aitchison with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: lori.idlout@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:57

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Lori Idlout** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Lori Idlout

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **lori.idlout@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Lori Idlout, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Lori Idlout, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and

that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place

courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to

acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse.

You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the

Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of

Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of

private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they

were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this

agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Lori Idlout, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the

execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Lori Idlout, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and

enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Lori Idlout, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Lori Idlout, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Lori Idlout, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Lori Idlout, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Lori Idlout, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Lori Idlout, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Lori Idlout with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: darrell.samson@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:57

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Darrell Samson** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Darrell Samson

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **darrell.samson@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Darrell Samson, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Darrell Samson, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik’s.

96. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Darrell Samson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Darrell Samson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon

breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated

restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially

compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Darrell Samson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Darrell Samson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Darrell Samson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Darrell Samson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath

to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed

objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Darrell Samson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Darrell Samson, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Darrell Samson with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: michael.mcleod@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:54

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Michael Mcleod** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Michael Mcleod

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **michael.mcleod@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Michael Mcleod, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Michael Mcleod, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the

functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word

"Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law,

and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under

international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following

fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be

made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed

with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good

standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or

1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the

new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-

Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Mcleod, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Mcleod, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or

enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your

actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Mcleod, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Mcleod, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Mcleod, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Michael Mcleod, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Michael Mcleod, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Michael Mcleod, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Michael Mcleod with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: joanne.thompson@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:54

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Joanne Thompson** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate

entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Joanne Thompson

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **joanne.thompson@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Joanne Thompson, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Joanne Thompson, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or

Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King

James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon

demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and

comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being

a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that "Canada's" geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the

meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat

currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my

standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful

benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to

target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate

securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse

compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse

directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or

expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares

after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named

to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Joanne Thompson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Joanne Thompson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity,

and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise

willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any

contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Joanne Thompson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Joanne Thompson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Joanne Thompson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Joanne Thompson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by

force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a

negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property

of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are

aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Joanne Thompson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Joanne Thompson, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of

Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Joanne Thompson with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: clifford.small@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:54

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Clifford Small** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Clifford Small

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **clifford.small@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Clifford Small, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical

organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Clifford Small, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military

receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues

as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research,

Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of

unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s)

to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless

damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to

them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The

administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and

remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence

evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of

agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's

consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or

1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the

new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-

Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Clifford Small, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Clifford Small, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or

enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your

actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Clifford Small, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Clifford Small, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Clifford Small, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Clifford Small, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Clifford Small, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Clifford Small, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Clifford Small with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: wayne.long@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:51

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Wayne Long** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Wayne Long

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **wayne.long@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Wayne Long, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Wayne Long, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and

that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Wayne Long, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Wayne Long, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Wayne Long, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Wayne Long, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Wayne Long, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Wayne Long, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Wayne Long, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Wayne Long, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Wayne Long with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: dominic.leblanc@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:51

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Dominic Leblanc** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Dominic Leblanc

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **dominic.leblanc@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Dominic Leblanc, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Dominic Leblanc, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or

surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit

such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of "Inherent Jurisdiction" that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

"Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times,

TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on

Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age

of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of

$20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not

currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the

account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement

did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Dominic Leblanc, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs

must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Dominic Leblanc, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and

ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Dominic Leblanc, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Dominic Leblanc, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Dominic Leblanc, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Dominic Leblanc, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Dominic Leblanc, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Dominic Leblanc, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Dominic Leblanc with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: serge.cormier@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:50

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Serge Cormier** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Serge Cormier

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **serge.cormier@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Serge Cormier, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Serge Cormier, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant", confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a "Know Your Client Form" proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares " and the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying "TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor's clients name)".

79. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a "Private Placement Agreement" to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Serge Cormier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Serge Cormier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon

breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated

restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially

compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Serge Cormier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Serge Cormier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Serge Cormier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Serge Cormier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath

to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed

objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Serge Cormier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Serge Cormier, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Serge Cormier with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: leah.gazan@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:48

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Leah Gazan** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Leah Gazan

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **leah.gazan@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Leah Gazan, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Leah Gazan, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of

my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word

"Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law,

and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under

international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following

fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be

made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount

of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related

processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario

Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and

"Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD

had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in

accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the "Privet Placement Subscription Form". The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a "SWAP" into the client's account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the "New Client's" RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with "Ontario Securities Act". TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC

Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Leah Gazan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Leah Gazan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the

above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Leah Gazan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Leah Gazan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Leah Gazan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Leah Gazan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Leah Gazan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Leah Gazan, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Leah Gazan with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: ted.falk@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:48

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Ted Falk** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Ted Falk

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **ted.falk@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Ted Falk, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Ted Falk, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and

that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place

courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to

acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse.

You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil

had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of "Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as

detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares

from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65

and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00

for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging

the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares

to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered

in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Ted Falk, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem,

[2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Ted Falk, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and

ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Ted Falk, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Ted Falk, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Ted Falk, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Ted Falk, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Ted Falk, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Ted Falk, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Ted Falk with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: terry.duguid@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:47

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Terry Duguid** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Terry Duguid

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **terry.duguid@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Terry Duguid, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Terry Duguid, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they

comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other,

then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and

seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities

Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy

back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul

Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and

orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Terry Duguid, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Terry Duguid, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance

with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Terry Duguid, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Terry Duguid, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Terry Duguid, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Terry Duguid, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32

of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Terry Duguid, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Terry Duguid, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Terry Duguid with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: brad.vis@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:45

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Brad Vis** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Brad Vis

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **brad.vis@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Brad Vis, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Brad Vis, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private

contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of

the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the

Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of

Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract,

ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they

were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this

agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Brad Vis, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the

execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Brad Vis, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and

enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Brad Vis, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Brad Vis, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Brad Vis, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Brad Vis, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Brad Vis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Brad Vis, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Brad Vis with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: tako.vanpopta@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:45

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Tako Vanpopta** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Tako Vanpopta

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **tako.vanpopta@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Tako Vanpopta, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Tako Vanpopta, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Tako Vanpopta, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Tako Vanpopta, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon

breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated

restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially

compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Tako Vanpopta, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Tako Vanpopta, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Tako Vanpopta, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Tako Vanpopta, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath

to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed

objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Tako Vanpopta, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Tako Vanpopta, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Tako Vanpopta with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: mark.strahl@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:44

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Mark Strahl** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Mark Strahl

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **mark.strahl@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Mark Strahl, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Mark Strahl, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of

my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word

"Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law,

and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under

international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following

fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be

made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount

of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related

processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario

Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and

"Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD

had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in

accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the "Privet Placement Subscription Form". The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a "SWAP" into the client's account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the "New Client's" RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with "Ontario Securities Act". TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC

Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Mark Strahl, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Mark Strahl, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the

above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Mark Strahl, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Mark Strahl, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Mark Strahl, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Mark Strahl, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Mark Strahl, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de

facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Mark Strahl, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Mark Strahl with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: elizabeth.may@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:42

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Elizabeth May** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Elizabeth May

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **elizabeth.may@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Elizabeth May, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Elizabeth May, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Elizabeth May, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Elizabeth May, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Elizabeth May, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Elizabeth May, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Elizabeth May, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Elizabeth May, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Elizabeth May, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Elizabeth May, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Elizabeth May with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: alistair.macgregor@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:41

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Alistair Macgregor** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Alistair Macgregor

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **alistair.macgregor@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Alistair Macgregor, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Alistair Macgregor, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for

example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or

surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor

(Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have

received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve

the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled

others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of "Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five

million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private

Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant", confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a "Know Your Client Form" proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD

Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors

(Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to

their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client”

information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505;

and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Alistair Macgregor, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Alistair Macgregor, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not

limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister

and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly

amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Alistair Macgregor, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including

misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Alistair Macgregor, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Alistair Macgregor, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Alistair Macgregor, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being

a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Alistair Macgregor, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Alistair Macgregor, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Alistair Macgregor with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: jenny.kwan@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:41

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Jenny Kwan** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Jenny Kwan

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **jenny.kwan@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Jenny Kwan, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Jenny Kwan, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper

House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond

the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of

alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of

fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and

financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that

this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and

Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies

outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence

evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of

agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's

consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or

1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the

new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-

Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Jenny Kwan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Jenny Kwan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or

enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your

actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Jenny Kwan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Jenny Kwan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Jenny Kwan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Jenny Kwan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Jenny Kwan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Jenny Kwan, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Jenny Kwan with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: sukh.dhaliwal@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:39

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Sukh Dhaliwal** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Sukh Dhaliwal

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **sukh.dhaliwal@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Sukh Dhaliwal, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Sukh Dhaliwal, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Sukh Dhaliwal, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Sukh Dhaliwal, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Sukh Dhaliwal, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Sukh Dhaliwal, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Sukh Dhaliwal, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Sukh Dhaliwal, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Sukh Dhaliwal, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Sukh Dhaliwal, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Sukh Dhaliwal with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: don.davies@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:38

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Don Davies** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Don Davies

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **don.davies@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Don Davies, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Don Davies, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and

that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they

were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this

agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Don Davies, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the

execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Don Davies, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and

enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Don Davies, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Don Davies, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Don Davies, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Don Davies, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Don Davies, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Don Davies, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Don Davies with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: marc.dalton@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:38

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Marc Dalton** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Marc Dalton

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **marc.dalton@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Marc Dalton, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Marc Dalton, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they

comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other,

then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and

seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities

Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy

back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul

Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and

orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Marc Dalton, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Marc Dalton, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance

with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Marc Dalton, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Marc Dalton, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Marc Dalton, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Marc Dalton, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32

of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Marc Dalton, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Marc Dalton, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Marc Dalton with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: dan.albas@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:35

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Dan Albas** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Dan Albas

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **dan.albas@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Dan Albas, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Dan Albas, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private

contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of

the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they

were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this

agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Dan Albas, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the

execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Dan Albas, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and

enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Dan Albas, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Dan Albas, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Dan Albas, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Dan Albas, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Dan Albas, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Dan Albas, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Dan Albas with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: len.webber@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:35

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Len Webber** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Len Webber

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **len.webber@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Len Webber, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Len Webber, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they

comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other,

then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and

seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities

Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy

back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and

responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Len Webber, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Len Webber, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment

arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions,

omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Len Webber, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Len Webber, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Len Webber, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Len Webber, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Len Webber, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Len Webber, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Len Webber with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: chris.warkentin@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:35

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Chris Warkentin** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Chris Warkentin

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **chris.warkentin@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Chris Warkentin, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Chris Warkentin, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Chris Warkentin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Chris Warkentin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Chris Warkentin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Chris Warkentin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Chris Warkentin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Chris Warkentin, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more

judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Chris Warkentin, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Chris Warkentin, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Chris Warkentin with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: heather.mcpherson@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:32

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Heather Mcpherson** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate

entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Heather Mcpherson

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **heather.mcpherson@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Heather Mcpherson, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Heather Mcpherson, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon

demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and

comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being

a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that "Canada's" geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the

meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat

currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my

standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful

benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to

target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate

securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse

compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse

directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or

expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares

after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named

to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Heather Mcpherson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Heather Mcpherson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity,

and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise

willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any

contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Heather Mcpherson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Heather Mcpherson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Heather Mcpherson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Heather Mcpherson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by

force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a

negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property

of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are

aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Heather Mcpherson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Heather Mcpherson, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of

Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Heather Mcpherson with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: greg.mclean@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:32

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Greg Mclean** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Greg Mclean

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **greg.mclean@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Greg Mclean, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical

organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Greg Mclean, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military

receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food,

education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research,

Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of

unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to

extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless

damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to

them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The

administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies

outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence

evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of

agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's

consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or

1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the

new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-

Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Greg Mclean, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Greg Mclean, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or

enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your

actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Greg Mclean, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Greg Mclean, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Greg Mclean, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Greg Mclean, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Greg Mclean, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Greg Mclean, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Greg Mclean with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: kelly.mccauley@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:32

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Kelly Mccauley** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Kelly Mccauley

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **kelly.mccauley@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Kelly Mccauley, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Kelly Mccauley, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Kelly Mccauley, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Kelly Mccauley, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Kelly Mccauley, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Kelly Mccauley, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Kelly Mccauley, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Kelly Mccauley, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than

the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Kelly Mccauley, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Kelly Mccauley, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Kelly Mccauley with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: jasrajsingh.hallan@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:29

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Jasrajsingh Hallan** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate

entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Jasrajsingh Hallan

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **jasrajsingh.hallan@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Jasrajsingh Hallan, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Jasrajsingh Hallan, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or

Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King

James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon

demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and

comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being

a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that "Canada's" geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the

meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat

currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my

standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful

benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to

target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate

securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse

compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse

directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or

expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares

after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named

to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Jasrajsingh Hallan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Jasrajsingh Hallan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity,

and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise

willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any

contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Jasrajsingh Hallan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Jasrajsingh Hallan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Jasrajsingh Hallan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Jasrajsingh Hallan, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by

force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a

negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property

of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are

aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Jasrajsingh Hallan, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of

Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Jasrajsingh Hallan with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: laila.goodridge@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:29

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Laila Goodridge** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Laila Goodridge

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **laila.goodridge@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Laila Goodridge, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an

ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Laila Goodridge, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military

receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues

as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research,

Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of

unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s)

to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless

damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to

them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The

administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and

remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence

evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of

agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's

consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase

the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified

Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul

Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and

orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Laila Goodridge, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Laila Goodridge, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance

with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Laila Goodridge, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Laila Goodridge, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Laila Goodridge, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Laila Goodridge, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section

32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Laila Goodridge, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Laila Goodridge, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Laila Goodridge with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: garnett.genuis@parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:28

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Garnett Genuis** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Garnett Genuis

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **garnett.genuis@parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Garnett Genuis, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Garnett Genuis, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot

support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of

the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1

S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the

person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this

provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground

of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard

Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on

his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities

laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse

compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the

applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a

nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)”

and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at

TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance

and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and

there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Garnett Genuis, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Garnett Genuis, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Garnett Genuis, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Garnett Genuis, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Garnett Genuis, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Garnett Genuis, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Garnett Genuis, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Garnett Genuis, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Garnett Genuis with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: h.yussuff@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:26

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **H Yussuff** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: H Yussuff

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **h.yussuff@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, H Yussuff, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, H Yussuff, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and

that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place

courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to

acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse.

You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the

Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of

Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of

private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they

were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this

agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man H Yussuff, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the

execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man H Yussuff, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and

enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man H Yussuff, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man H Yussuff, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man H Yussuff, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man H Yussuff, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by H Yussuff, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, H Yussuff, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, H Yussuff with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: suze.youance@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:25

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Suze Youance** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Suze Youance

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **suze.youance@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Suze Youance, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Suze Youance, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik’s.

96. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Suze Youance, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Suze Youance, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon

breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated

restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially

compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Suze Youance, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Suze Youance, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Suze Youance, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Suze Youance, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath

to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed

objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Suze Youance, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Suze Youance, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Suze Youance with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: yuenpau.woo@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:25

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Yuenpau Woo** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Yuenpau Woo

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **yuenpau.woo@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Yuenpau Woo, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Yuenpau Woo, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of

my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word

"Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law,

and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under

international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following

fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be

made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount

of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related

processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario

Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)”

and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at

TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance

and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and

there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Yuenpau Woo, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Yuenpau Woo, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Yuenpau Woo, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Yuenpau Woo, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Yuenpau Woo, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Yuenpau Woo, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Yuenpau Woo, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Yuenpau Woo, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Yuenpau Woo with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: paula.simons@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 23:22

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchman2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Paula Simons** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Paula Simons

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **paula.simons@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Paula Simons, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Paula Simons, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Paula Simons, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Paula Simons, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Paula Simons, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Paula Simons, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Paula Simons, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Paula Simons, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Paula Simons, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Paula Simons, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Paula Simons with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: patti.laboucane-benson@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:53

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Patti Benson** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Patti Benson

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **patti.laboucane-benson@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Patti Benson, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Patti Benson, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of

any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit

such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

“Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW

and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw

to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD

Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share

certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by

instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no

ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-

performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Patti Benson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Patti Benson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour,

non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under

principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of

losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Patti Benson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Patti Benson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Patti Benson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record,

ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Patti Benson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by

the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a ‘natural’ person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships,

associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms

of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Patti Benson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a

man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Patti Benson, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Patti Benson with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: jane.macadam@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:53

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Jane Macadam** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Jane Macadam

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **jane.macadam@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Jane Macadam, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Jane Macadam, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik’s.

96. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Jane Macadam, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Jane Macadam, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon

breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated

restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially

compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Jane Macadam, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Jane Macadam, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Jane Macadam, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Jane Macadam, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath

to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed

objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Jane Macadam, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Jane Macadam, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Jane Macadam with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: paul.prosper@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:52

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Paul Prosper** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Paul Prosper

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **paul.prosper@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Paul Prosper, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Paul Prosper, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of

my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word

"Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law,

and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under

international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following

fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be

made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount

of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related

processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario

Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)”

and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at

TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance

and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and

there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Paul Prosper, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Paul Prosper, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Paul Prosper, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Paul Prosper, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Paul Prosper, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Paul Prosper, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Paul Prosper, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Paul Prosper, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Paul Prosper with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: rosemay.poirier@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:52

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Rosemay Poirier** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Rosemay Poirier

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **rosemay.poirier@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Rosemay Poirier, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Rosemay Poirier, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosemay Poirier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosemay Poirier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosemay Poirier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosemay Poirier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosemay Poirier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosemay Poirier, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath

of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Rosemay Poirier, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Rosemay Poirier, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Rosemay Poirier with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: don.plett@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:52

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Don Plett** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Don Plett

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **don.plett@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Don Plett, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Don Plett, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and

that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place

courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to

acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse.

You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the

Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of

Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of

private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they

were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this

agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Don Plett, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the

execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Don Plett, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and

enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Don Plett, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Don Plett, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Don Plett, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Don Plett, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Don Plett, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Don Plett, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Don Plett with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: lucie.moncion@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:52

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Lucie Moncion** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Lucie Moncion

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **lucie.moncion@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Lucie Moncion, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Lucie Moncion, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Lucie Moncion, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Lucie Moncion, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon

breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated

restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially

compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Lucie Moncion, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Lucie Moncion, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Lucie Moncion, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Lucie Moncion, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath

to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed

objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Lucie Moncion, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Lucie Moncion, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Lucie Moncion with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: julie.miville-dechene@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:52

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Julie Dechene** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Julie Dechene

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **julie.miville-dechene@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Julie Dechene, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Julie Dechene, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the

functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word

"Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law,

and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under

international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following

fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be

made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed

with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good

standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or

1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the

new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-

Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Julie Dechene, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Julie Dechene, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or

enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your

actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Julie Dechene, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Julie Dechene, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Julie Dechene, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Julie Dechene, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Julie Dechene, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Julie Dechene, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Julie Dechene with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: marie-francoise.megie@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:52

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Francoise Megie** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Francoise Megie

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **marie-francoise.megie@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Francoise Megie, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Francoise Megie, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Francoise Megie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Francoise Megie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Francoise Megie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Francoise Megie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Francoise Megie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Francoise Megie, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath

of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Francoise Megie, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any

unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Francoise Megie, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Francoise Megie with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: tony.loffreda@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:51

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Tony Loffreda** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Tony Loffreda

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **tony.loffreda@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Tony Loffreda, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Tony Loffreda, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Tony Loffreda, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Tony Loffreda, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Tony Loffreda, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Tony Loffreda, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Tony Loffreda, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Tony Loffreda, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Tony Loffreda, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Tony Loffreda, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Tony Loffreda with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: mohammad.alzaibak@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:50

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Mohammad Alzaibak** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Mohammad Alzaibak

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **mohammad.alzaibak@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Mohammad Alzaibak, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Mohammad Alzaibak, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially

performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II

and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a

Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or

surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor

(Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have

received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve

the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled

others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of "Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five

million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private

Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant", confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a "Know Your Client Form" proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD

Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors

(Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to

their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client”

information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505;

and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Mohammad Alzaibak, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Mohammad Alzaibak, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not

limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister

and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly

amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Mohammad Alzaibak, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including

misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Mohammad Alzaibak, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Mohammad Alzaibak, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Mohammad Alzaibak, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being

a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership,

corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm

wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Mohammad Alzaibak, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Mohammad Alzaibak, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Mohammad Alzaibak with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)
FROM: Mail Delivery Subsystem <mailer-daemon@googlemail.com>
TO: johncarry77666@gmail.com
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:50
ATTACHMENTS (20250423-225059-0004711): message.delivery-status , message.rfc822.eml

Address not found

Your message wasn't delivered to **watchmam2059@yahoo.com** because the address couldn't be found or is unable to receive email.

The response from the remote server was:

```
552 1 Requested mail action aborted, mailbox not found
```

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: watchmam2059@yahoo.com
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:50

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Watchman Watchman** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Watchman Watchman

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **watchmam2059@yahoo.com**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Watchman Watchman, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Watchman Watchman, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or

Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King

James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon

demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and

comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being

a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that "Canada's" geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the

meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat

currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my

standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful

benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to

target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate

securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse

compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse

directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or

expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares

after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named

to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Watchman Watchman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Watchman Watchman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity,

and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise

willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any

contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Watchman Watchman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Watchman Watchman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Watchman Watchman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Watchman Watchman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by

force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a

negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property

of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are

aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Watchman Watchman, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Watchman Watchman, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of

Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Watchman Watchman with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: clement.gignac@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:50

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Clement Gignac** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Clement Gignac

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **clement.gignac@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Clement Gignac, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an

ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Clement Gignac, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military

receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues

as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research,

Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of

unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s)

to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless

damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to

them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The

administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and

remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence

evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of

agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's

consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase

the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified

Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul

Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and

orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Clement Gignac, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Clement Gignac, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance

with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Clement Gignac, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Clement Gignac, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Clement Gignac, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Clement Gignac, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section

32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his

will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations,

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Clement Gignac, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Clement Gignac, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Clement Gignac with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to

this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: amina.gerba@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:50

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Amina Gerba** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Amina Gerba

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **amina.gerba@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Amina Gerba, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Amina Gerba, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private

contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority’s edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God’s ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of

the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a

recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1

S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the

person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this

provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground

of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of

election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik.

The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his

inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the

investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase

transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your

acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD

Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that

the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors.

Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance

requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the

OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Amina Gerba, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Amina Gerba, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes,

maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Amina Gerba, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses,

Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Amina Gerba, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Amina Gerba, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Amina Gerba, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance

to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the

scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any

recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Amina Gerba, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Amina Gerba, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Amina Gerba with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: rosa.galvez@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:50

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Rosa Galvez** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Rosa Galvez

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **rosa.galvez@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Rosa Galvez, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Rosa Galvez, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and

that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian

monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosa Galvez, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosa Galvez, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosa Galvez, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosa Galvez, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosa Galvez, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Rosa Galvez, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Rosa Galvez, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Rosa Galvez, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Rosa Galvez with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: donna.dasko@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:50

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Donna Dasko** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Donna Dasko

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **donna.dasko@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Donna Dasko, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Donna Dasko, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of

any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit

such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

"Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW

and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw

to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD

Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share

certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by

instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no

ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-

performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Donna Dasko, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Donna Dasko, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour,

non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under

principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of

losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Donna Dasko, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Donna Dasko, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Donna Dasko, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record,

ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Donna Dasko, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the “Defender of the faith”, then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty’s government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by

the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a ‘natural’ person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word ‘person’.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships,

associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms

of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Donna Dasko, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a

man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Donna Dasko, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Donna Dasko with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: pierrej.dalphond@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:49

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Pierrej Dalphond** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Pierrej Dalphond

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **pierrej.dalphond@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Pierrej Dalphond, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Pierrej Dalphond, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial

entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal

Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and

apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private

property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers’ licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or

other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer

and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand

Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario

Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a "Letter of Permission" to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik’s.

96. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and

Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW,

shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual

Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that "Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)" and "Investor Representation Letter" were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Form" were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. "Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact

forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with

all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who's named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield "Sale Assistant" by TD Waterhouse's compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierrej Dalphond, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierrej Dalphond, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the

conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful

blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of

adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierrej Dalphond, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierrej Dalphond, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierrej Dalphond, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Pierrej Dalphond, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly

dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or

any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because

there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent,

voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Pierrej Dalphond, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Pierrej Dalphond, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally

against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Pierrej Dalphond with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: jean-guy.dagenais@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:49

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,

owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Guy Dagenais** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Guy Dagenais

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **jean-guy.dagenais@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Guy Dagenais, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Guy Dagenais, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and

powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva

Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating,

obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as

in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

    These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

    ….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

    (1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

    I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and

Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and

remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence

evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of

agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's

consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser's accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share's sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With "Hatice Pakdil" indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or

1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the "Privet Placement Agreement" in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW "Rate Tables", the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or "Trade". TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the "Letter of Authority" provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a "Contractual Relationship" with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the "Private Placement" were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A "SWAP" would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" sent out the required documentation to setup the

new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-

Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Guy Dagenais, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Guy Dagenais, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or

enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your

actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Guy Dagenais, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my

choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Guy Dagenais, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Guy Dagenais, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Guy Dagenais, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Guy Dagenais, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Guy Dagenais, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Guy Dagenais with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: patrick.brazeau@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:49

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Patrick Brazeau** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity

of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Patrick Brazeau

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **patrick.brazeau@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Patrick Brazeau, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Patrick Brazeau, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to

establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the

documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have

been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription". The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor's accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "Privet Placement Subscription Forms" also contained the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" that indicated "I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential "New Client" information that was provide to TDW as part of the "Know Your Client" information form. This form is mandatory as part of the "Ontario Securities Act". This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the "New Client's" eligibility, as to weather or not they were an "Accredited Investor" under the definitions in the "Ontario Securities Act" in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King's instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the

client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the

Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and

President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Patrick Brazeau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Patrick Brazeau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not

required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated

in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Patrick Brazeau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Patrick Brazeau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Patrick Brazeau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Patrick Brazeau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more

judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story’s Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that ” if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not

exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by

lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a “Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate,” and on page 1461, Unregenerate means “not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as “the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid.”

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as “a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ’s divinity; a perfectionist.”

And in the Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as “any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God.”

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a ‘human being’, or a ‘humanitarian,’ they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), “I’m an animal; I’m a monster; I’m not saved; I’m unrepentant; I’m an unregenerate sinner; I’m not converted; I’m wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I’m cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ’s divinity and the importance of a belief in God.”

a. “Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God’s law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect.” Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351.” [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, “law” suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term “human beings” only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let’s look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men

who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, “human beings.”

“And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?” [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The “human beings” of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term “human being” is also synonymous with the term ‘natural man.’

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more,

Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God’s law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Patrick Brazeau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed

de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Patrick Brazeau, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Patrick Brazeau with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: yvonne.boyer@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:49

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Yvonne Boyer** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of

Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Yvonne Boyer

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **yvonne.boyer@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman's eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Yvonne Boyer, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Yvonne Boyer, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God's minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario

and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James

Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the "International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights" article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was "Shanghaied" by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the "Defender of the faith" and now King Charles III "Defender of the faith". This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or

third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of

the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the

Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be

irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006”, Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish

facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a “Suitability Review” before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid

by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not

before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD’s New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule “A” Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW’s “New Client(s)” instructs there “Investment Advisor” Hatice Pakdil to “acquire” shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.” Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase.

They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Yvonne Boyer, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing

that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Yvonne Boyer, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability,

validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the

scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Yvonne Boyer, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Yvonne Boyer, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Yvonne Boyer, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute

binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Yvonne Boyer, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath

bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam.

R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not "the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation". I am not "labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." So, I cannot be a 'person' under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an "individual". Black's Law Dictionary also defines a person as a "human being," which they define by stating "(i.e. natural person)". So, let's first check to see if I am an "individual".

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word

‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human being’ does not appear to have a ‘legal’ definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster’s Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘human’ as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] “Sprung of humans that inhabit earth.” …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words ‘Hue’ (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can’t go there, because the word would then mean ‘coloured man’!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I’m not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word ‘man’ through Webster’s because there appears to be no legal definition for ‘man’.

Man – Webster’s 1888 Dictionary defines ‘man’ as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an ‘individual’, so I cannot be considered ‘of the human race’; and since I’m not of the human race, I can’t be ‘a human being’, and I’ve also been shown that I’m not a ‘person’ either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a ‘person’, an ‘individual’, or a ‘human being’? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually ‘dead.’ This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘human being’, etc., are not in Christ. Words like “individual,” and “human being” do not even appear in Scripture! These are ‘created’ terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the ‘old man‘, but not the ‘new man‘ in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine’s Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as “See Monster.” On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as “a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal.”

In Webster’s New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as “a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others.” From the Random

House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. “The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor.” [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN

Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).
169. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.
170. It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.
171. It is agreed by Yvonne Boyer, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling

with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Yvonne Boyer, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Yvonne Boyer with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping

in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: victor.boudreau@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:49

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Victor Boudreau** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Victor Boudreau

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **victor.boudreau@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Victor Boudreau, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Victor Boudreau, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to

respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the "Constitution of Canada" except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word "Canada" in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the "JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT"

6. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor

in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter's individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the "law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power"

14. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states;

education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or

surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as

it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit

such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of "Inherent Jurisdiction" that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my

consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of

"Conspiracy" under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and "Fraud and Perjury" under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005", had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil's employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice's actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil’s statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times,

TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed "Private Placement Agreement" (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on

Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age

of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in “Street Form” and indicating: “This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares.” TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an “Investor Representation Letter” indicating the declaration by the investor; “I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company” and “ I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. “This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of

$20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not

currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…" and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client's funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a "Small Business Investment Trust" (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the "New Clients" were established. Hatice Pakdil was their "Investment Advisor" and responsible for the client's account. The Company completed all the requirements of a "Pre-Approved Privet Placement". Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the

account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.”. , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares” with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement

did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Victor Boudreau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs

must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Victor Boudreau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and

ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that

jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice,

enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Victor Boudreau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Victor Boudreau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God’s justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Victor Boudreau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both

spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Victor Boudreau, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God’s law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the "Rule of law" spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee's via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God's law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word "do" are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word "Persons" is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women

cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: "The term 'person' may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual."

Person – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines 'person' as follows: "In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers." Person – Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime's Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons", which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster's 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn't it odd that the word lawful is

not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

“individual” as follows: “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.”

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a ‘person’, and since

‘individual’ denotes a single ‘person’ as distinguished from a group or class, I can’t be an ‘individual’ under this definition either. But I see the term ‘natural person’ used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a ‘natural’ person, since I know I am not an ‘artificial’ one.

I could not find the term ‘Natural person’ defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word ‘natural’ for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines ‘Natural’ as follows: “Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word “artificial”. The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term “legal”; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions.”

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word ‘man’ means), or by influences of civilization? I don’t think so. Am I ‘wild’, or ‘untutored’? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word ‘artificial’, it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a ‘natural’ person, under this definition of the word ‘natural’. So, the term ‘natural person’ cannot apply to me.

Black’s Law Dictionary also used the term ‘human being’, and although Black’s defined it as a ‘natural person’, maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a ‘human being’. ‘Human’ or ‘human

being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas

Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The ‘natural man’ in Scripture is synonymous with the ‘natural person’ as defined in man’s laws.

“Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person.” Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for ‘bastard’ or illegitimate.” [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716.” Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he’s dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary’s dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled “Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation,” dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and

agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Victor Boudreau, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to

the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Victor Boudreau, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Victor Boudreau with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!

SUBJECT: Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement
FROM: "minister Richard Henry" <johncarry77666@gmail.com>
TO: margaretdawn.anderson@sen.parl.gc.ca
DATE: 23/04/2025 22:48

cc. watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com,
owlmon@protonmail.com,
watchmam2059@yahoo.com

From: Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, 24th April 2025, A.D. Year of our lord.

c/o minister Richard Henry

Place of Worship and Sanctuary

116-75 Dowling Ave.

Email: watchmanezekiel33@yahoo.com

Ontario, Canada, the geographical location no code, non commercial

To: **Margaretdawn Anderson** the private man/woman acting as Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian consists of as a de facto member of parliament or senate having jurisdiction over contracted legal fiction corporate entity of Canada, created by the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom under a commercial statute applicable upon the corporate registrants of the de facto Country of Canada.

c/o: Margaretdawn Anderson

Parliament of Canadia
House of Commons and
The Senate of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario,
Geographic Location

Sent to **margaretdawn.anderson@sen.parl.gc.ca**

no code, non-commercial

Notice for a Demand of an Ecclesiastical Accommodation and Agreement

Provided under Christ's careful direction and the watchman’s eye of Ezekiel 33

In the holy name of Christ, as where two or more agree in His holy name, for the will of our father, it shall be done. Matthew 18;20

If one falsely accuses another of a crime, the punishment due to that crime should be inflicted upon the perjured informer. Maxims of law

Hello, Margaretdawn Anderson, I am Richard of the Ochnik family, a flesh blood and bone living man created by God and an officiating minister of the Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International, an ecclesiastical organism of other flesh, blood and bone men and women as the many members of the body of Christ. Where truth is, fiction of law dose not exist. Maxims of law;

If ever the law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later. Maxims. Acts 5:29

1959 CanLII 50 (SCC) | Roncarelli v. Duplessis | CanLII, Margaretdawn Anderson, by my sending you this private good faith agreement, I do attempt, by Christ's guidance, to ascertain all the facts in scriptural honour. If you have any reason or proof to suggest or provide to me, God’s minister officially performing the functions of my calling, that the following statements of the facts are not true, you are being offered the opportunity to refute these offered facts so as to clear yourself of any assumptive contractual awareness of the truth of such facts. Also be aware, this communication of agreement cannot be lawfully inquired of at public or government expense as it is a provable private matter and government funding cannot support private contracts. All legal bills must and shall be paid for out of your private pocket no different than Maurice Duplessis the former Premier and Attorney General of Quebec in Roncarelly v Duplessis

This is Demand for recognition as Christ's ordained minister in quest of defense of the faith to save harmless my soul.

Both parties agree to act in good faith, ensuring no misleading actions or omissions that could undermine the intent or enforceability of this agreement. Each party is obligated to respect the natural rights and freedoms outlined herein.

I declare that I am that God created, of a Christian given name Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, chosen to be a private ecclesiastic man under God as my creator with dominion over the earth. I do declare that no man or woman has a moral or a lawful right to impose anything upon me without my informed consent; and that I do hereby renounce any fraudulent corporate assumptive contract by the right of self determination and faith renouncing secular Contracts. Amselem 2004 SCR.

I do honour the directive obligation to respect the equal God given freedoms of other men and women under His law. To all those who set eyes on this ecclesiastical declaration, I do hereby, officially performing the functions of my calling, serve notice to all private men and women as of my inability to respect persons that receive this that any offer herein, prior to, or on my part does not imply acceptance of intimidation, violence, or threats of violence against me, and that no such offer implies that I will submit to any nuisance obstruction or intimidation in the future.

I, as a bondservant of Christ do henceforth offer the good faith proclamation of my free born will to live in peace and declare that, by right of God and his son Jesus words at Corinthians 7:20:26, the de facto

authority's edicts, codes, obligations, statutes, taxes, licenses and prohibitions of a de facto commercial entity are not binding on me, John 15:16 ordained minister or applicable upon God's ministers and family, his Children and including their property.

I, minister Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, an ordained minister under John 15:16 and a watchman as per Ezekiel 33:6–9, hereby invoke the protections afforded by "Operation SILENT DEFENDER." This military receivership, initiated in response to systemic fiduciary breaches, encompasses the unauthorized creation and exploitation of my Cestui Que Trust, originating from my 1960 birth certificate.

For the purposes of this Agreement, the terms "man" and "woman" (also

Queen and King) are used interchangeably and are intended to be inclusive of all individuals, regardless of gender identity. Any reference to a specific gender shall be construed to include all genders, and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to exclude any person based on gender.

1. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I, minister of Richard Henry of the Ochnik family was on or about the 30th of November, 2004 A.D., unlawfully intimidated and obstructed, by you, in your private capacity, by methods not sanctioned and as such, being a perceived and negative nuisance to my ability to perform an official function of my ministerial calling, are in violation of Sections 126,176, 423, 465 and 180 of the Criminal Code of Canada by violating your Oath of Allegiance and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

2. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I am not a member of a dead legal fiction entity corporation known as Canada or Ontario and that specifically my name, being my ecclesiastical possession under the exclusive authority of God, is not allowed by my faith in God's commands as defended by the Queen you swore an oath to be truly allegiant to, to be used, recorded, registered, altered used for or exchanged for a financial purpose without my permission that it has never been offered or pledged to be for any of those reasons or to be used as a surety or as a commodity with my informed consent.

3. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada is a Crown Corporation in the meaning of the act with sworn allegiance to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. The Country of Canada is accountable to the Queen Elizabeth II and heirs. On the passing of Her Royal Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Crown had been passed to her heir, King Charles III.

4. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that. It is agreed by you, that in 1966 ICCPR and ICESCR Signed: 19 December 1966 The principles of the UDHR offered hope and inspiration around the world. But to make a genuine difference in people's lives, those principles needed to be transformed into laws. In 1966, the UN Commission on Human Rights drafted two instruments to give legal force to the

UDHR. One instrument was called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The second was the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Together with the Universal Declaration, they comprise the International Bill of Human Rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offers protections for the right to life, freedom of speech, religion, and voting. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights focuses on such issues as food, education, health, and shelter. More than 160 nations have ratified these two covenants which legally commit them to ensure these rights for people within their borders.

5. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact that in the Supreme Court Judgments [1980] 1 SCR 54 1979-12-21 Re: Authority of Parliament in relation to the Upper House Further, although s. 91(1) gave the Queen the power, with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, to alter the “Constitution of Canada” except in certain expressly designated areas, it does not confer a power to amend the B.N.A. Act. The word “Canada” in s. 91(1) does not refer to Canada as a geographical unit but refers to the “JURISTIC FEDERAL UNIT”

6. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1981 Zingre v.The Queen et al., [1981] 2 SCR 392 (Supreme Court of Canada). It is a recognized principle of international customary law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its international obligations.

7. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that; This contract is governed exclusively by the Law of God as found in the 1611 King James Bible, and the sanctuary jurisdiction under which it was formed. All disputes shall default to this sacred law unless waived in writing by the minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

8. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1982 the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Canada was implemented as the supreme law.

9. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1989 Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038, 1989 The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach

of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority

10. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1990 Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

11. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1997 The Supreme Court has made it clear in cases M. (A.) v. Ryan that Common Law in Canada Now Flows through the Constitution Act of 1982. M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, that the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (Listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

12. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 1999 R. v. Hynes, 1999 CanLII 18979 (NL CA) [101] The determination whether to enforce constitutionally protected rights under s. 24(2) was never intended to revert to the executive arm of government. Indeed, as has already been discussed, a primary purpose of the Charter was to place courts between the executive and the individual to protect the latter’s individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

13. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2005 Court Judgement Supreme Court- Christie v. British Columbia, 2005 BCCA 631(CanLII)The rule of law embraces at least three principles. The first principle is that the “law is supreme over officials of the government as well as private individuals, and thereby preclusive of the influence of arbitrary power”

14. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2007 R. v. Hape, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 2007 SCC 26 Para 53… It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation that legislation will be presumed to conform to international law. The presumption of conformity is based on the rule of judicial policy that, as a

matter of law, courts will strive to avoid constructions of domestic law pursuant to which the state would be in violation of its international obligations.

15. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in 2015 R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCJ 66 The Rule of Law The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new. The contemporary concept of unwritten constitutional principles can be seen as a modern reincarnation of the ancient doctrines of natural law

16. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Victoria (City) v. Adams, 2009 BCCA 563; 2008 BCSC 1363; The trial court found the prohibition of temporary overhead shelter in parks to be unconstitutional where there was a lack of alternative shelter space. The court held the issue to be clearly justiciable because it dealt with the constitutionality of a legal prohibition. The court relied on the right to adequate housing under international human rights law as an interpretive aid. The Court referred to submissions made by Canada to the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regarding the scope of domestic protections for the right to housing and on General Comment No. 4 on the right to adequate housing under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The Court noted that the question of whether the right to life, liberty and security of the person imposes positive obligations on governments to ensure the right to housing has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court of Canada and did not need to be decided in this case, which only challenged state interference.

17. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in Thompson v. Ministry of Revenue [1946] SCR 209, 1946 CanLII 1 (SCC) [Page 220] Residents are taxed, not Canadians; but residents within the meaning of the Act…

18. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada, the Provinces, and Territories, may produce; acts, enactments, statutes, rules, ordinance, laws, regulations and so forth but they do not apply to men and women and are limited in its scop of authority. Deuteronomie 12;32

19. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Canada had failed in its obligations in accordance with the “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” article 13 this is where it brings forth education regarding our rights and obligations concerning education, we find the following agreement that states; education first and foremost shall be for the promotion of human rights and freedoms. This education was denied and hidden form me so that it could be deprived from my rights and force me to slavery for a de facto fictional state against my free will. In this case

ignorance is an excuse because as a child underage, I relied on the integrity, honesty of my pears that fraudulently, by omission deprived me of truth, to maximize their ability to extort funds from me by way of unlawful intimidation. It is unconscionable that abuse and manipulation with the intention to deceive a child could be argued as acceptable and binding later on an adult.

20. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I was “Shanghaied” by Canada forcefully arbitrarily redefining me as a class of person(s) to extend Civil Law and enactments on me knowing at all times it was not lawful and a violation of the Constitution of Canada (1982), international Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Convention, contrary to the King James Bible 1611 and their oath to the Queen Elizabeth II the “Defender of the faith” and now King Charles III “Defender of the faith”. This process was accomplished without my knowledge or consent with an intention to unlawfully profit by way of fraud, intimidation making it unlawful and invalid. I do not agree and do not accept this offer to contract.

21. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

22. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Non-performance of this agreement shall be deemed as an act of confession and consent to immediate enforcement of all remedies herein, including liens, writs, or seizure without further notice.

23. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter 22.

24. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private woman or man with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

25. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister

not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

26. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself de facto Chair, in the de facto Group President and Chief Executive Officer of TD Bank Group, in the de facto country of Canada (or Provinces and other) has any oath bound nor civil authority to intimidate or obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

27. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you I have an unfettered right to any and all information regarding any Trusts, Bonds, Annuities and financial instruments, Trustees acting on my behalf. I have the right to seize all property connected to me directly or indirectly.

28. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Registrar General of each province and territory possesses a seal of office, as outlined in the Vital Statistics Act (or similarly named legislation). For instance, Ontario's Vital Statistics Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. V.4, s. 7(2) states: "The seal of office may be reproduced in any manner and has the same effect when it is manually applied or otherwise reproduced." In accordance with this provision, I assert the irrevocable right to utilize the reproduced seal of the Registrar General as a signatory, thereby exercising full authority to lawfully discharge any personal debts by placing the seal on the document as my sole required approval to access government accounts, to my own benefit. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the government shall, upon demand by myself or third-party creditors, settle all such accounts owing from its own funds within ten (10) days, ensuring that I am held harmless from any associated liabilities, free and clear without recourse. You agree to provide Minister Richard and other designated individuals with revolving credit and debit facilities, enabling access to government payment obligations and facilitating point-of-purchase transactions without delay or the necessity for additional documentation.

29. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I have the right to not use a last name or surname, including on my bank account, government identification, and on other identification and things. You respect my right to have not accept the Surname or last name and only use my Christian name(s). You have no right to force me to sin Matthew 23; 9-11. Any use of government identification is not acceptance of liability or surety of any legal fiction in law and is clearly a separate identity from the natural man; the two may not be cojoined in any way, shape or form.

30. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger (2020 SCC 45) reinforces the duty of honest performance in contractual dealings, requiring all parties to act transparently and in good faith. This duty is essential to prevent misleading or deceptive conduct within the framework of agreements.

31. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the case Roncarelli v. Duplessis (1959) underscores the principle that no party, including government officials or corporate entities, may exercise arbitrary authority to undermine the rights of others. This principle aligns with the fair treatment and protection sought under this agreement

32. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing, and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

33. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the Charter, Section 2(a) – Freedom of religion Provision; 2. Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: freedom of conscience and religion. Similar provisions may be found in the following Canadian laws and international instruments legally binding on Canada: section 1(c) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 3 of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The Canadian Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion as does section 15 of the Charter. That is the highest law which favors religion Maxims of law. See also the following international, regional and comparative law instruments that are not legally binding on Canada but include similar provisions: article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 12 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, article 12 of the American Convention on Human Rights, article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

34. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the trust (also known as the "Entitlement Certificate, Bond, Trust, or Annuity") is my entitlement property. It becomes mine upon the process of "redeeming the entitlement certificate." As a man of God, I may elect to be the "trustee", “steward” and/or the "beneficiary" of the "entitlement certificate" and thereby settle all matters and redeem the trust. In redeeming the "entitlement certificate," I act as the Creditor (Private) within the banking system, not as a Debtor (Public). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that any use of my name, or any altered form thereof as it appears on my birth certificate, for the purpose of obtaining funds or engaging in financial transactions without my informed consent, constitutes unauthorized use. Such actions

are recognized as infringements upon my rights. Consequently, any funds or assets obtained through such unauthorized use are to be returned to me immediately, in full, as per my directions. It is also affirmed that the state holds no right to utilize my name in commerce without my explicit and informed consent. You and your agents agree to provide me with all assets, bonds, trusts, annuities, or other properties belonging to me within 30 days, to be transferred to me in full as per my directions. Additionally, I assert my right to hold all property in private, free from public claim or registration, in accordance with the principles of common law and the recognition of private property rights. This includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property without undue interference or regulation by public authorities, except as authorized by law.Matthew 7:7-8

35. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that Canada has not fulfilled its obligation to elderly men and man and the funding provided to them through Canada Pension and CCP or other programs is grossly inadequate, insufficient and below the poverty line. Canada has moral obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living, as in its obligations in International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. I am now demanding that this be rectified immediately, and you are committed and will make certain that my income will never be below the poverty level.

36. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that I have the right to unfettered access and use of crown land as steward. This stewardship of land and homestead will be passed on to my family or Christian family as I see fit, all or in part without restriction, limitation or interference in any way shape or form. Genesis 1;26-28 Matthew 7:7-8

37. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors, (that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

    These are the words in the Oath of Office Act, indicating prima fascia an unlawful, unsanctioned, deficient form by the omission of the word “do” in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance thus effectively invalidating the oath by making the oath grammatically incoherent.

    I, ..., swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.

These are the words from the federal Oath of allegiance Act for Canada

….. it is very clear as to how the oath is to be worded in Canada, it is

(1) Every person who, either of his own accord or in compliance with any lawful requirement made of the person, or in obedience to the directions of any Act or law in force in Canada, except the Constitution Act, 1867 and the Citizenship Act, desires to take an oath of allegiance shall have administered and take the oath in the following form, and no other:

I, ……., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors. So, help me God. The deviation from the prescribed form of the oath, such as the omission of the word "do" in the Provincial Oath of Allegiance, results in a grammatically incoherent and legally deficient oath. This deficiency effectively invalidates the oath, rendering any authority exercised under its auspices unlawful. The administration or reliance upon such an invalid oath may constitute a criminal offence under the Criminal Code of Canada. Specifically: Canadian Criminal Code: Section 122, Section 131 and Section 132. Therefore, proceeding with or acting upon an oath that deviates from the legally mandated form may expose individuals to criminal liability under these provisions.

38. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that “Canada’s” geographical limits are delineated in the Canada Land Surveys Act Section 24 and that Canada being the land mass spoken of in that enactment, only includes the North West Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon as provinces as concurred in section 2 of the criminal code and section 30 of the de facto Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

39. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any disagreement, dispute, ambiguity, or challenge regarding the meaning, scope, application, or intention of any term, clause, or provision of this agreement, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, shall have the sole, exclusive, and final authority to determine its correct meaning, interpretation, and intent, at my own discretion and for my benefit. This right shall be irrevocable, nonreviewable, and binding upon you and all third parties under the principles of private contract, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and law of equity. No court, tribunal, or external body shall override this interpretive authority without my express written consent.

40. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement is irrevocable and includes and extends to, fellow ministers, my heirs, defined herein to include all individuals, regardless of biological or marital relation, who have received God's calling as ministers, and who have been granted equivalent rights as I have here in this Agreement.

41. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that God and the bible is the supreme law and there is no limitation periods set forth to limit such laws of God.

42. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that words in the masculine mean and include the feminine and vice versa.

43. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any disputes arising from this agreement shall be resolved equitably, in a court of inherent jurisdiction, ensuring that all decisions respect fairness and the principles of natural justice.

44. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no other court may trespass or have jurisdiction over this agreement other than a court of “Inherent Jurisdiction” that recognises, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, along with the Royal Style and Titles Act, and respecting the purpose of section 176 and 180 of the criminal code in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

45. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, retain and reserve the exclusive, unfettered right to demand settlement, restitution, or payment under this agreement to be rendered in physical gold and/or silver bullion coins, in such combinations as I shall elect. Specifically, said payment shall be made in the form of: 1 oz Gold Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $1,400.00 CAD per ounce;1 oz Silver Maple Leaf Coins, valued at a fixed rate of $25.00 CAD per ounce. I may elect to receive payment in Canadian dollars, gold, silver, or any lawful combination thereof, and this election shall be binding upon you and enforceable under private contract, ecclesiastical law, and equity. You agree that all physical coin payments shall be delivered: To the physical location(s) of my choosing, and ; At no cost, burden, or fee to me; Within thirty (30) calendar days of the notice of election or demand for payment. Any failure to deliver in full, or any attempt to substitute fiat currency or non-specified bullion against my will, shall constitute a material breach of this contract and an actionable ecclesiastical trespass, giving rise to further damages, liens, and lawful enforcement.

46. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware and with private knowledge that the Royal Style and Titles Acts purpose is to defend the faith and save it harmless as an obligation of all Oath sworn allegiants.

47. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; If any breach of this agreement is not cured within 30 calendar days of notice, I reserve the right to escalate the matter to any court of equity, ecclesiastical forum, international tribunal, or forum of conscience at my sole discretion and to my own benefit.

48. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I am not the surety, debtor, or chattel, for any fictional entity that was created without my consent as it may appear on my birth certificate, passport, drivers' licence, documents or other, and I will be held safe and harmless from any and all liability or responsibility.

49. The creator of the fiction is the surety and fully responsible and liable for all issues (save me harmless). The use of my flesh as surety was obtained in fraud and is null and void. As a man or woman of God, our debts are blotted out and forgiven forever-more and we are now in the book of life. ISAIAH 43:25; COLOSSIANS 2:14

50. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that if this contract is to be challenged in court and questioning its authority and rights, or other, then I will be fully compensated for defending the integrity of this contact in accordance to my fee schedule as determined by me from time to time, at my own discretion, paid in advance as per my own direction as I see fit.

51. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement establishes mutual acknowledgment of the rights, obligations, and remedies outlined herein, grounded in principles of good faith, natural equity, and fairness. It provides a clear-period framework to ensure transparency and enforceability under both secular and equitable principles.

52. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that clauses, paragraphs, and subparagraphs contained in this Agreement are intended to be read and construed independently of each other. If any part of this Agreement is held to be invalid, this invalidity will not affect the operation of any part of this Agreement.

53. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no term or paragraph of this agreement has the intention or the ability to change my standing to any derogatory title such as person, citizen, taxpayer, inspector, driver, hunter, resident, or other. I am always to be in my standing as a man or woman, minister of God, in my full right and inherent jurisdiction in accordance with the king James Bible 1611 and Gods laws. I am not part of any collective. DEUTERONOMIE 12:32

54. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing; "OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc., heard on March 1,2, 8 and 9, 2006", Hatice Pakdil had testified under oath untruthfully committing perjury, specifically but not limited to; that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also misled others stating that she did not work on behalf of the Company yet at all times TDW were paid a 7% commission selling Company shares to investors. The OSC used the case results listed in paragraph 46, as evidence of truth in subsequent hearing knowing, at all times that TDW

were participating in a conspiracy and fraud to protect themselves from liability. This is an act of “Conspiracy” under Section 463 Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46), and “Fraud and Perjury” under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C46)

55. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing of ; “OSC in the mater of the Ontario Securities Act R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5. as amended and in the matter of TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. heard on September 19TH, 2005”, had provided information knowing it to be untruthful, specifically but not limited to, that Richard Ochnik being the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. Hatice Pakdil had also falsely stated that she was not working on behalf of the company. Hatice was not truthful and attempted to cover up her own securities violations involving a material conflict of interests representing of both the buyer and seller the same security without disclosure to the parties. This was a direct conflict of interest and prejudicial to the parties. This violation is called Crossing of Securities. Hatice Pakdils actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c.). The hearing(s) outcome were based on fraudulent mislead information that altered the outcome of this case and the case in paragraph 45 and 47 above. In This case TDW false information was accepted as truth without the involvement and opportunity for Richard Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. to enter defence evidence to the contrary trespassing on their inherent rights. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful to protect her job and the expense of others and wrongfully was enriched.

56. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that during the hearing: Christa Ochnik and Ontario Securities Commission, Provence of Ontario, TD Waterhouse, Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD Bank) and Hatice Pakdil. Hatice, had submitted a defence that was knowingly, to be untruthfully specifically but not limited to, statement that Richard Ochnik was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. The argument that Richard was the de facto officer was not raised in the above two cases and could not be contested by Richard Ochnik. The Intention of the false information was to deceive the court for the inequitable wrongful benefit of Hatice Pakdil’s employer and other defendants depriving the plaintiff of their rights under colour of law. Hatice Pakdil knowingly at all times had not been truthful in an attempt to protect her job and unlawfully gain from her crime. This resulted in fraudulently depriving Christa and her sisters a free born minors of their rightful inheritance as beneficiary of the Ochnik Family Trust. Hatice’s actions were an act of Perjury under Section 131 (1) Criminal Code (rsc,1985, c. C-46)

57. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, was subjected to unlawful, cruel, and degrading treatment amounting to torture, as detailed in associated affidavits and records. You agree to settle this claim for five million Canadian dollars ($5,000,000.00), payable in accordance with Clause 43, including the option for delivery in 1 oz gold or silver Maple Leaf coins at fixed

valuation. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days, to the location of my choosing, at no cost to me. This settlement is final, binding, and not subject to future challenge or revision.

58. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that [First Name] [Last Name] TD Waterhouse, Michael Watson, OSC, and key investigator John Humphrey were fully aware of the untruths and perjury of witnesses and conspired to target, in a conspiracy to harm Richard Ochnik and 1464210 Ontario Inc. as are now listed here in. The Ontario Securities Commission Deprived the defendants of their Rights Under the Colour of Law for undue enrichment of themselves and TD Bank, contrary to section 242, criminal code.

59. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event any matter arising from this agreement or involving Hatice Pakdil, is brought before any court, tribunal, or public forum, you shall pay, in advance, a fee of one hundred thousand Canadian dollars ($100,000.00) per appearance or filing involving the undersigned, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family. This payment shall be made no less than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing or submission and is due regardless of who initiates the proceeding. This amount represents pre-compensated time, spiritual harm, reputational risk, and administrative burden, and shall be required before any engagement in public process or appearance of any kind. Failure to tender this fee in advance shall be deemed a refusal of lawful jurisdiction, a breach of agreement, and shall authorize the undersigned to decline participation without prejudice or to initiate immediate private enforcement.

60. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Moore (Chairman) should have not been the Chairman on two hearings involving Richard Ochnik due to a conflict of interest. Its unconscionable to have expected the Chairman to rule in conflict with his earlier ruling. The Chairman did not have the lawful authority to change what was established as fact by himself in a earlier hearing without an appeal. Holding a hearing and agreeing on key facts without allowing Richard Ochnik to offer a defence was a trespass on his inherent rights, malicious slander, and libel. This technicality was deliberate to target Richard Ochnik because despite all evidence to the contrary in his own hearing it would not change the established facts from the previous case. In essence his case was lost before it started.

61. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard Ochnik refused to testify because he did not recognise the jurisdiction of the OSC on a man. His appearance was limited to assist the tribunal only on a non prejudice bases to establish facts. Richard Ochnik was not under oath. Also hearsay evidence was admitted from individuals that were not under oath.

62. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1463210 Ontario Inc. did not agree that Richard Ochnik was the de facto President or controlling mind. Ian would be the best evidence to this fact.

63. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that contrary to Hatice Pakdil's statements under oath at the above hearing(s), at all times, TDW and OSC was fully aware that Richard Ochnik was never the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc., and it was actually always Ian Ochnik. The OSC had in its position Company documents clearly indicating Ian Ochnik was the incorporator, sole Director, and De jure President of the Company. TDW had contracted with Ian Ochnik. Richard Ochnik was not part of the securities negotiations, and his function was landlord and general contractor.

64. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC deliberately altered the truth to coincide with others knowing that it would be detrimental to Richard and the Ochnik Family. TDW fraudulently assisted the OSC to target Richard by naming him as the President and other deception to extend the authority of Ontario Securities Commission and placing unwarranted statutory obligations on Richard trespassing on his rights to which he would not normally or lawfully be expected to have as a man. Leviticus 6:2-5

65. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW told investors that Richard Ochnik was the President and Hatice Pakdil directed Company shareholders to contact him by releasing his private cell phone number without Richard's consent causing confusion. TDW and OSC had also misled investors telling them that Richard was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc.

66. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had not received consent from Richard Ochnik to buy, sell, trade, or SWAP any securities of 1464210 Ontario Inc. nor have TDW ever had such a discussion with him.

67. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had no direct knowledge of Richard instructing the Company to violate securities laws.

68. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge of any Company loans given to any of the shareholders of the corporation, OSC have not seen any executed loan agreements or any records of transfer of funds, cheques or any other negotiable instruments, to any of the shareholders of 1464210 Ontario Inc. (company) involving the Company, Richard Ochnik or Ian Ochnik.

69. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC have no knowledge and have never seen an executed “Private Placement Agreement” (approved by TD Compliance and TD lawyers) signed by the President Ian Ochnik or any approved agent of the company for any of the investors.

70. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had verified through correspondence and meetings that Ian Ochnik that he was the President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and Hatice had received his signed authorization on Compliance Documentation along with a “Letter of Permission” to deal directly with Paul Panciw to facilitate the share trades. TD Waterhouse (TDW) had direct contact with the securities lawyer working for 1464210 Ontario Inc.

71. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Richard was not at the time Trustee of the Ochnik Family Trust. The Trust was the property owner (landlord) and Richard over seen the renovations made possible by Investor Co. share purchases in 1464210 Ontario Inc.

72. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that when TDW investors transferred accounts to TDW they were in cash accounts form the other institutions and possessed no shares of the Company.

73. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all necessary documents were processed to perform the transactions of acquiring shares and preforming a subsequent SWAP were all signed by Ian Ochnik President as requested and directed by TD Compliance and others within TD Waterhouse.

74. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse, Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant”, confirmed the authorization to proceed with the transaction by TD Compliance Department and instructed, Ian Ochnik President to the amount of the shares purchased, clients name and the client account numbers, that were being acquired for the individual accounts.

75. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that no payments for the shares purchases were until it was approved by TD Waterhouse compliance at the time a trade was transacted. The company produced and delivered the share certificates and TD Waterhouse handed over payment for those certificates from the cash in the investors accounts as stated above, making the share purchase at the time of payment. Ian Ochnik and the company were vulnerable to Hatice Pakdil that had full control of the process.

76. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had completed a “Know Your Client Form” proved by TD

Complaint Department before notifying the Company and Ian Ochnik with particulars of the transaction.

77. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all investors had signed the “Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares ” and the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” stating that TDW investors had no shares of the company and had no right to purchase shares from the company. The share sale and purchase took place on the crossing of the share certificate and TD Waterhouse payment on behalf of the investor and no sooner.

78. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the share certificates were executed and signed by Ian Ochnik President specifying “TD Waterhouse in Trust for (TDW investor’s clients name)”.

79. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that had a contractual agreement and obligation with 1464210 Ontario Inc. to provide services for a “Private Placement Agreement” to which TDW had confirmed by fax with Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO, (authorized by Ian Ochnik President to negotiate the arrangement with Hatice Pakdil).

80. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Mr. Paul Panciw, Company CFO was licenced with the Ontario Securities Commission.

81. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had received a commission of 7% for each share an investor purchased with the Company base value of $1/share. If there was no such purchase, TDW would not receive a commission. TDW commissions totaled approximately $107 000 based on 7% of sales.

82. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were at the time a licensed broker with the Ontario Securities Commission and good standing.

83. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that funds from the purchaser’s accounts, TDW clients were paid for by TD Waterhouse directly to 1464210 Ontario Inc. for the share purchase by cheque indicating the Company as a "Client".

84. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that 146420 Ontario Inc. had paid TDW the agreed commissions for each share’s sale/purchase transaction by way of a cheque signed by Ian Ochnik President. Cheques

were made out to "Pay to the order of: TD Waterhouse - investment advice." With “Hatice Pakdil” indicated in the notes.

85. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW never told the Company that TDW were not working for them. Given all the documents it would clearly indicate that they were confirmed to be working with TDW as their broker on record.

86. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shareholder investors 1464210 Ontario Inc. were also clients for TDW and TD Waterhouse.

87. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW and OSC do not know of any investor on 1464210 Ontario Inc. that was over the age of 65 and had purchased shares from 1464210 Ontario Inc.

88. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were the only broker selling shares of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and responsible to maintain the company in compliance with all securities regulations.

89. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was TDW Sales Assistant, and he was actively assisting in processing of the trades and had direct knowledge of the transactions playing a key role in the approvals to facilitate the purchase and subsequent SWAP of the shares.

90. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC ambushed Richard Ochnik during his hearing and knew he had a lawyer but refused to remand the case to meet the lawyers schedule and there by prejudicing the defence. There would have been no damage to any party to have delayed the hearing.

91. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that in order for the shares to be SWAPED the cash in the account had to be used to purchase the shares earning TDW the commission. Them the newly purchased shares could only be SWAPED into the individual accounts earning TDW fees from the investors paid to TDW.

92. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that you accept full responsibility for any and all additional costs, fees, charges, or expenses incurred as a result of delays, administrative actions, defense filings, or any other related processes necessitated by your actions or omissions.You acknowledge and agree that the applicable fee schedule detailing such costs is available for your review at TD-lied.com or can be provided to you upon your written request. You further agree that this fee schedule is

subject to amendments and updates from time to time, at the sole discretion and for the exclusive benefit of the minister, without prior notice to you. Such amendments are binding and non-disputable.Your acceptance of this clause signifies your consent to these terms and your obligation to remit payment for any applicable fees as outlined in the current fee schedule.

93. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, at TD Waterhouse assisted TDW on a regular daily bases and had direct contact with most if not all investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. and reported to Hatice Pakdil.

94. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield was the liaison or facilitator between TD Waterhouse, TD Waterhouse compliance, 1464210 Ontario Inc., Ian Ochnik and TDW investor clients. Hatice Pakdil overseen the transactions as broker on record and de facto Trustee for the Ochnik Family Trust beneficiaries.

95. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC knowledge the key players involved; Ian Ochnik President and Paul Bayfield TD Waterhouse Sales Assistant were not questioned by the Ontario Securities Commission investigators regarding the facts for the 2 hearings above. They were not interviewed in fear their statements would confirm Richard Ochnik was not the President, de facto President or controlling mind. Also the Settlement Agreement Dated September 19 2005, between the OSC and TD Waterhouse was a conspiracy based on fraud to target the Ochnik's.

96. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc and Paul Bayfield were not subpoena or questioned by the Ontario Security Commission Hearings Involving 1464210 Ontario Inc and Richard Ochnik, contrary to the best evidence rules and practice. In this investigation the OSC exercised willful blindness and colour of law.

97. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after 1464210 Ontario Inc., refused to give a loan to Dan Miller. The Company offered to buy back the shares at a premium price. TD Waterhouse refused to allow the share buy back. TD Waterhouse and/or TD bank had arranged a loan for Dan Miller an investor in 1464210 Ontario Inc. after he had purchased share without knowledge or involvement of Richard Ochnik, Ian Ochnik or 1464210 Ontario Inc. This loan given by TDW was a violation of the Ontario Securities Act and was intended to cover up TDW securities violations.

98. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the company refused to provide a loan because it would be a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. Instead, the Company offered to buy back Dan Millers Shares, investment with a nominal profit. To me this totally contradicts the OSC claims that the company

was involved in a RRSP loan scam. The company specifically told share holders they do not do loans and they would buy back all shares from individuals requesting RRSP loans. The company, 1464210 Ontario Inc. was vulnerable, totally relying on the performance of Hatice Pakil and TD Waterhouse. TD Waterhouse obstructed remedy by disallowing the buy back of shares deliberately to hold the vulnerable company in potential violation of the Ontario Securities Act.

99. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that providing a loan to a shareholder for the purchase of shares is a violation of the Ontario Securities Act. and a taxable benefit.

100. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was responsible to assess the investors and conduct a "Suitability Review" before instructing the Company to issue any shares. The company was detrimentally reliant upon TDW to take appropriate steps and precautions required to protect both the buyer and seller being TDW client(s), in a prohibited scheme referred to as crossing of securities.

101. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company was directed by TDW to produce a sample share certificate. The share certificate was not in "Street Form" and indicating: "This is to Certify That T. D. Waterhouse, in trust for _____is the Registered Holder of _____ Shares." TDW would provide the name of the client to be inserted along with the account number after compliance approvals instructing the shares to be issued. Hatice Pakdil was the controlling mind of the company transaction.

102. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW advised the Company to produce an "Investor Representation Letter" indicating the declaration by the investor; "I do not currently own, Direct or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc., or any other related Company" and " I do not have any Rights to acquire any TDW, shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. "This letter was a requirement to be signed by all TDW investors in 1464210 Ontario Inc. before the purchased shares. It is agreed by you, [First Name] [Last Name], the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW agreed to be broker of record May 06, 2002.

103. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that a sales compensation package was negotiated by Paul Panciw CFP (Certified Financial Planner) for the Company with TDW, Hatice Pakdel, on May 06, 2002, at 12:27 PM.

104. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the Company had cooperated with all TDW requests and did everything it was requested promptly to do to TDW satisfaction.

105. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that failed to provide full disclosures to the defendants as required by law. TDW did not send a copy of the “Privet Placement Agreement” in fear of incriminating Hatice Pakdil. TDW were aware that this document would have a direct impact on the outcome of the case establishing that the company had a licenced broker and was detrimentally reliant on TD Waterhouse to save it harmless and to maintain the Company in good standing to all related regulations and Acts.

106. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the sales transaction consisted of a 7% commission calculated on the sale amount of shares and a $25 000 (in cash or shares) bonus for achieving each million dollars in sales threshold. The Company offered shares or cash as payment; as part of TDW selling shares and purchasing them for their clients RRSP accounts. Share sales generate a sales commission paid by the seller Company and SWAPS generate a fixed fee paid by the investor buyer – both were TDW clients.

107. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that According to the TDW “Rate Tables”, the Company would be charged the flat fee of $20.00 for a SWAP but rather a commission for a sale or “Trade”. TDW negotiated a commission representing the sale of shares.

108. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that after TDW due diligence by their lawyer, Compliance Department, Branch Manager and RRSP Department, that TDW assistant Paul Bayfield, Sales Assistant, then notified the Company that they were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and SWAP of the shares.

109. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Ian Ochnik President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. was satisfied and by the “Letter of Authority” provided Paul Panciw with the authority to bind the Company in a “Contractual Relationship” with TDW. (There was an agreement and mutual understanding). A contract was signed by the Company solidifying the relationship. TDW became brokers of record.

110. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all the sales commissions for the “Private Placement” were paid only by the Company to avoid a conflict of interest. A “SWAP” would not generate a commission but flat fee.

111. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield “Sales Assistant” sent out the required documentation to setup the new client accounts and to facilitate the sale of shares to the potential investor as Hatice Pakdil new client of TD Waterhouse.

112. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that “Privet Placement Subscription Forms (for the Purchase of Small Business Shares)” and “Investor Representation Letter” were directly sent to the potential investors (Hatice Pakdil clients) and TDW would have full knowledge of there response keeping it confidential from the company.

113. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Form” were not a binding contract: paragraph 4. “Acceptance of Subscription: This subscription will be and be deemed for all purposes to have been accepted by the Corporation when the Corporation gives notice in writing to the purchaser of the allotment and issuance of the Shares subscribed for, but the corporation shall be under no obligation to accept this subscription”. The share sale only occurred once TD Waterhouse paid for the shares from the cash in the, the private man with no dispute to the investor’s accounts and not before. Before that could happen, TD had to notify the company regarding the buyer, account number and number of shares.

114. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “Privet Placement Subscription Forms” also contained the “Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)” that indicated “I do not currently own, directly or indirectly, any shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc…” and was signed by the purchaser acknowledging the statement to be true. This clearly indicated TDW could not preform a SWAP with out first purchasing the shares. TDW then proceed to purchase the shares, by instructing Ian Ochnik, President to produce the share certificates as directed by TD compliance department (providing investor name, amount of purchase and account number).

115. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD Waterhouse set up the new client accounts, transferred the client’s funds from other institutions into the TD Waterhouse account as cash. The accounts were all self directed RRSP accounts and all part of a “Small Business Investment Trust” (SBIT). This Trust was in place before the company approached TDW and not established exclusively for this transaction. fact forthcoming from you that all the accounts were transferred as cash and as such they all had cash in the accounts and no shares of other companies specifically 1464210 Ontario Inc. Shares then needed to be sold by the company and purchase by Hatice Pakdil clients; then healed in a holding account prior to the SWAP taking place into the RRSP account generating a fee.

116. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the “New Clients” were established. Hatice Pakdil was their “Investment Advisor” and responsible for the client’s account. The Company completed all the requirements of a “Pre-Approved Privet Placement”. Hatice Pakdil testified under oath that she considered herself as an order taker and not adviser to the new clients facilitating the buy and sale of the Company shares.

117. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TD's New Client were asks online F) to charge the transaction fee to their account at TD Evergreen a division of TD Securities. TD Securities is a division of TD Bank (Schedule "A" Bank).TD had received transaction fees from the buyer and the seller in the same transaction and was a conflict of interests and kept secret by TDW to the detriment of the company and investors. Hatice Pakdil committed perjury by saying she did not represent the company. Neither party, buyer or seller knew TDW was working and paid by both the buyer and seller.

118. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that all of TDW's "New Client(s)" instructs there "Investment Advisor" Hatice Pakdil to "acquire" shares in 1464210 Ontario Inc. for there RRSP account. Indicating they had no possession of shares to do a SWAP unless Hatice Pakdil processed the purchase/sale of shares.

119. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW had direct knowledge that the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." were not signed because clients kept changing the number of shares that they were purchasing. The change would have triggered a requirement to amend the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares." Also, there was no practical way to confirm the amount of shares that the client could afford to purchase until the account was moved to TDW and in a cash position. TDW needed to know the cash availability to calculate the number of shares to be purchased at $1.00 per share. Also, the "Investor Representation Letter (for the purchase of small business shares)" told TDW that they had no ownership of shares or rights to purchase shares indicating the buy and sell had not taken place yet until TD gave the company the cheque payment for the shares as stipulated on paragraph 5 of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares.". , the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW, Hatice Pakdil did speak to potential investors before the signing and execution of the "Private Placement Subscription Form Re; Purchase of common shares" with the help of TDW sales assistant. This fact clearly confirms that Hatice Pakdil had purchased shares form TDW Customer the Company to facilitate a SWAP for TDW investment clients.

120. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Paul Bayfield "Sales Assistant" contacts the Company to order shares after acquisitions were approved by TD Compliance and before the shares were issued by the Company and delivered to TDW.

121. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW were placing orders acquiring and selling shares to TDW investors.

122. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company had no access to the privet and confidential “New Client” information that was provide to TDW as part of the “Know Your Client” information form. This form is mandatory as part of the “Ontario Securities Act”. This information would provide TDW Compliance and Hatice Pakil with the necessary information to determine the “New Client’s” eligibility, as to weather or not they were an “Accredited Investor” under the definitions in the “Ontario Securities Act” in accordance with the company lawyer, Mr. King’s instructions regarding compliance requirements provided to TDW. 1464210 Ontario Inc. was detrimentally reliant on TDW to access accounts and determine suitability to maintain regulations. The company had no access to the client information due to TD investor confidentiality requirements. TDW approved share purchases without verifying investor eligibility as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

123. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares are property of the issuer and not the subscriber according to the terms of the “Privet Placement Subscription Form”. The investor had only made an offer to purchase. They only transferred share ownership when TD handed the company payment for the shares representing consideration in a purchase.

124. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that TDW was negligent and processed the transaction as a “SWAP” into the client’s account. As a result, the head office review of trades was per TDW Policy 2 and that requirement did not take place as required by regulation. If it was done properly the issue would have been discovered in the first trade and saved the Company. The Company had no knowledge of TDW errors. TDW had an obligation to correct the issue and save the company.

125. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the shares were distributed to the “New Client’s” RRSP accounts by TDW as a trade and then followed by a SWAP.

126. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that The Company paid TD Waterhouse about $107,000 to act as licensed broker and Adviser for the Company. The Company paid TD Waterhouse for advice and sales commissions of 7%. The Company relied on TD Waterhouse to follow the rules and to maintain 1464210 Ontario Inc. in compliance with “Ontario Securities Act”. TD Waterhouse, through Paul Bayfield, dealt with all the investors and instructed the Company as to how much and who’s named to place on each share certificate. No subscription agreement was exercised by 1464210 Ontario Inc. The go ahead was given to Paul Bayfield “Sale Assistant” by TD Waterhouse’s compliance department. Paul Bayfield was TDW assistant and received instructions from TDW. TDW had over seen each of the transactions.

127. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that as part of the settlement agreement it was admitted by TD Waterhouse failed to comply with the suitability requirements to its clients contrary to section 1.5 of rule 31505; and that TDW failed to comply with its obligation to deal with its clients fairly by failing to disclosure to the clients the 7% commission that were paid to TDW contrary to section 2.1(2) of rule 31-505 and there by acted contrary to the public interests and placing the company in violation with the Ontario Securities Act.

128. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that if TDW told the truth and admitted that TDW had errored the company and the Ochnik Family specifically the Trust would have not suffered such an unconscionable punishment and the three children freeborn beneficiaries would and should have been saved harmless.

129. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement explicitly extends its protections and obligations to include my immediate family members and members of my religious community who share in the principles outlined herein.

130. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that this agreement includes a survivor clause. The obligations and protections under this agreement , the private man with no dispute to the shall extend beyond the lifetimes of the signatories, ensuring continued enforceability for their successors, heirs, and representatives.

131. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, the private man/woman, that failure to honour this agreement, in whole or in part, constitutes a continuing tort, ecclesiastical offense, and bad faith breach, and that such non-performance will result in the accrual of additional damages, to be determined at the sole discretion of Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family or any of his successors in ecclesiastical office.

132. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, with no lawful objection registered, that these damages result from a coordinated breach of fiduciary duty, misrepresentation, fraud, and criminal obstruction. You agree that full restitution and remedy are due immediately, without the necessity of further adjudication, and that enforcement may proceed through any lawful means, including equity process, private lien, sheriff application, or ecclesiastical summons.

133. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by not being forthright and truthful TDW participated in a fraud to your own benefit and profit at the expense of the Company. It is unconscionable that Hatice Pakdil

allowed and orchestrated this fraud with the help TDW employer, Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) and Paul Moore Chairman.

134. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that Delivery of Gold/Silver Coins: The undersigned party reserves the right to demand settlement in the form of physical gold or silver Canadian Maple Leaf coins... All coin payments must be delivered, at no cost to the undersigned, to the location(s) of their choosing within 30 calendar days.

135. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that prior to this hearing above mentioned, TDW witnessed and were fully aware that the OSC Chairman Paul Moore is on record stating that Richard Ochnik was the incorporator and President of 1464210 Ontario Inc. and that he was trading in securities without a licenced broker including other facts prior to Richard Ochnik Hearing know it to be not true.

136. It is agreed by you, the private man Margaretdawn Anderson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that both parties herein acknowledge and affirm reliance on the judicial interpolations and jurisprudential authority of the following cases, as they are instructive and binding in equity, conscience, and constitutional review: Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson, [1989] 1 SCR 1038 — affirming that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrides statutory discretion where fundamental freedoms are at stake; Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] SCR 121 establishing that personal liability arises where public officials act beyond lawful power or in bad faith; Callow v. Zollinger, 2020 SCC 45 — confirming the duty of good faith and honest performance in the execution of all private agreements, whether formal or informal; Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551 — upholding that sovereign religious and spiritual beliefs must not be abridged or interfered with by state or commercial entities, and may not be redefined by third parties.

137. It is agreed by you, the private man Margaretdawn Anderson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you,, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of breach, dishonour, non-performance, refusal to cure, or silence beyond the agreed Clear-Period, you do hereby: (a) Confess judgment in advance, without protest, to the full amount of damages declared in this agreement and/or any affidavit, declaration, or notice associated thereto; (b) Waive any and all procedural objections to enforcement or collection; (c) Consent to immediate enforcement by private lien, ecclesiastical summons, equity writ, or sheriff application, in any court of record or jurisdiction selected solely by Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, without the need for further hearing or approval; (d) Acknowledge that this confession is made in good faith, with full notice, and without coercion, and is enforceable under the maxims of law, the principles of equity, and the conscience of both natural and divine law. Such judgment shall be deemed entered ab initio upon breach or failure to respond within the agreed cure period, and the undersigned party may act as witness, creditor, and claimant without estoppel or restriction.

138. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that It is agreed and declared that any entity or institution, including but not limited to TD Bank Group or any of its subsidiaries, who has received any benefit, gain, asset, equity, or enrichment arising from the breach, fraud, misrepresentation, or fiduciary failure described herein, shall be deemed liable under the doctrine of Unjust Enrichment and Constructive Trust. Such liability is enforceable regardless of formal privity with this agreement, and may be pursued through private lien, lawful trust claim, ecclesiastical forum, or court of equity. TD Bank is hereby placed on notice of their direct and vicarious liability for unjust enrichment and is invited to cure such injury by full restitution. Failure to do so shall trigger enforcement without further notice.

139. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the issue of controlling mind was never raised at any of the hearings as it was not required being that we relabelled Richard “the President” although he was never the President. This manipulation was done to prevent Richard from filing an appeal for justice and to entrap him, forever closing the case with total disregard for the truth.

140. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the facts, declarations, and agreed damages contained herein form the complete and final understanding of the parties as to the events, injuries, and remedies arising from the harms described. You acknowledge that even if new facts, documents, witnesses, or information may come to light in the future, such developments shall have no effect on the enforceability, validity, or terms of this agreement, nor shall they diminish, delay, or alter your obligation to pay all declared compensation, restitution, and penalties agreed herein. This clause shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the principles of finality, spiritual equity, private contract, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. You waive all future claims to modify or re-negotiate the terms on the basis of later evidence, understanding that this agreement stands in full faith and resolution, now and forever.

141. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that the OSC did not use best evidence rules and relied on hearsay, when always Ian Ochnik the President was available to establish true facts. Ian Ochnik was the best person who would have had known firsthand if Richard was the controlling mined and advised him to violate the Ontario Securities Act or any law. Ian Ochnik was not questioned deliberately to disadvantage Richard Ochnik in a planed ambush.

142. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that by naming Richard Ochnik as President it allowed the OSC to exercise willful blindness, color of law and overreach to circumvent and extend its mandate avoiding its legislated restrictions set by parliament; prejudicing Richard of access to protections available by proper judicial process of law normal to all defendants.

143. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, acting in my capacity as minister and lawful living man, have suffered actual, documentable, and irreparable harm arising directly from your actions, omissions, or complicity, including but not limited to: Spiritual desecration and the unlawful obstruction of ecclesiastical office; Financial loss and misappropriation of sacred trust property; Psychological duress, unlawful detention, medical neglect, and cruel and unusual treatment; Violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and breach of covenant, contract, and international trust law.

144. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that that the Tribunal was specifically targeting Richard Ochnik and TDW had participated in this and other hearings to establish false evidence as truth to be used at this hearing with the intention to cause harm to him for TDW direct benefit and others.

145. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the undersigned is a minister in full spiritual and ecclesiastical standing, holding office under divine commission and not subject to any corporate fiction, statutory overlay, or commercial presumption. This contract is governed exclusively by ecclesiastical jurisdiction, natural law, conscience, and international covenant, including protections under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR.

146. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no civil or statutory tribunal shall have jurisdiction to hear or alter any matter arising from this agreement without mutual consent, full disclosure, and written agreement, and that jurisdictional default shall vest in the ecclesiastical forum governed by the 1611 King James Bible, Canon Law, and the Royal Style and Titles Act.

147. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that accepting this Clear-Period Private Agreement as a private treaty, enforceable under principles of equity, conscience, and spiritual law. You agree that this treaty shall not be superseded, annulled, or diminished by statute, fiat, judicial assumption, or administrative action. Breach shall result in immediate invocation of all available lawful and ecclesiastical remedies.

148. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, is agreed that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik Family, act at all times in my proper capacity as a living man, spiritual minister, and lawful executor of the Ochnik Family Trust, with full rights of conscience, covenant, and ecclesiastical standing. I do not operate under any contract of adhesion, corporate fiction, statutory persona, or commercial designation without express written and witnessed agreement.

149. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that all words and definitions used in this agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical canon, scriptural doctrine, and spiritual covenant, unless explicitly amended in writing by mutual, witnessed addendum. Scriptural interpretation and authority rest with the undersigned minister and his successors.

150. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; In the event that either the Bank of Canada or the Royal Canadian Mint ceases to mint the said coins or withdraws them from circulation, it is agreed that a comparable sovereign-minted, bullion standard coin of equal weight and purity shall substitute for settlement purposes, maintaining the above-stated fixed valuations as approved by minister Richard as per his sole discretion and to his own benefit.

151. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you that OSC seen pictures of the facility functioning as agreeing with representations made to TDW investors, including Richards functioning Christian chapel that was subsequently forced to close with no fault of Richard or his conduct.

152. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that your actions, in alignment with TD Waterhouse (TDW), have caused the 'Ochnik Family Trust' financial harm exceeding $60 million (sixty million) Canadian dollars in damages. These damages are the direct result of your dishonest and manipulative conduct, as evidenced by material facts and supporting documentation. In accordance with equitable principles and the scriptural obligation of restitution outlined in Leviticus 6:2-5, you are required to restore the full amount of stolen, extorted, or fraudulently obtained property, along with any additional losses resulting from your actions. Should you fail to comply within 30 days of receipt of notice, enforcement proceedings will be initiated, including immediate application to a sheriff for recovery of the specified amount under applicable enforcement laws.

153. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that based on conservative financial calculations from 2004, reflecting a doubling of losses every four years due to compounding factors, the current value of damages sustained by the 'Ochnik Family Trust' is estimated at over $280 (two hundred and eighty) million Canadian dollars. This figure accounts for the compounded harm caused by your actions, including but not limited to fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud, and obstruction of justice. Full restitution of this adjusted amount is required to prevent further harm and ensure compliance with the principles of fairness, truth, equity and good faith.

154. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are responsible to make the “Ochnik Family Trust” whole by

financially compensating them for all their losses and damages in 30 days on demand. Payment will be, as directed by minister Richard Henry family of Ochnik.

155. It is agreed by you, the private man Margaretdawn Anderson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that in the event of any breach of this agreement, including misrepresentation, fiduciary breach, fraud, or delay in remedy, I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, acting as minister and also steward or trustee, shall be entitled to initiate enforcement in any competent forum of my choosing. All damages, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, including psychological, spiritual, and economic harm, shall be calculated in good faith and are enforceable under equity and law. The obligation to remedy these harms shall include but not be limited to: Direct financial losses, Reputational and spiritual harm, Involuntary service and elder abuse And Constitutional violations of conscience and trust; Leviticus 6:2–5 and Isaiah 61:7

156. It is agreed by you, the private man Margaretdawn Anderson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that I, Richard Henry of the Ochnik family, shall retain the sole, unfettered right to elect the forum and venue in which enforcement, adjudication, or interpretation of this agreement may be pursued. This includes courts of record with inherent jurisdiction, whether within Canada or the United States, including ecclesiastical or international human rights tribunals. Such selection shall be made at his sole discretion and shall be binding upon all parties as agreed in advance. This clause serves to ensure full access to fair and impartial adjudication under the maxims of law, international covenant, and God's justice.

157. It is agreed by you, the private man Margaretdawn Anderson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the material admissions contained within this Clear-Period Contract constitute binding declarations of fact and law. You acknowledge that any failure to publicly correct or retract previous defamatory or fraudulent claims, including those issued by TD Bank Group, TD Waterhouse, OSC, or their agents, shall constitute an ongoing and compounding harm under both spiritual law and equity. The duty to correct includes issuing an open retraction to restore my name, ministry, trust estate, and familial dignity.

158. These authorities are incorporated into this agreement as interpretive anchors, and the parties agree to rely upon their reasoning and precedent in any tribunal, forum, or court of record, ecclesiastical or civil, as may be engaged for the resolution or enforcement of this contract.

159. It is agreed by you, the private man Margaretdawn Anderson, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that failure to respond to or rebut this agreement within 30 days constitutes tacit admission and contractual default. In such case, I shall have full standing to enter judgment and proceed to enforcement, including garnishment, lien, or seizure under the applicable statutes or ecclesiastical process, without further notice or leave of any court.

160. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman in office who upholds the law of the land and has

taken an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant, that if they do not know what that true allegiance is when asked, that they have provided irrefutable evidence that they lied to get their job.

161. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an oath to a Christian Monarch is an act of religious worship and all who refuse to acknowledge and submit to that fact are imposters who lied to get their job. See Westminster Confession of Faith Act of the British Parliament 1648 chapter22.

162. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man , with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that an agent of her Majesty when failing to acknowledge they have an oath of allegiance to the defender of the faith and recognition of the supremacy of God relieves themselves from sworn duty and reverts themselves to a private man or woman with no more judicial authority than the sovereign inheritance of birth as they have by lack of recognition of those prime points of law indicated they perjured themselves when swearing their oath to God.

163. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that a minister once notifying whoever obstructs them that he is a minister not bound by commercial law in performing the functions of his calling and that unless proof to the contrary is evident, the man or woman once made aware of the ministry being performed, has no sanction in law or from the Christian monarch they swore to be truly allegiant to, to obstruct, intimidate or act as a nuisance to him while performing the official functions of his calling.

164. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no woman calling himself Chair of the Ontario Securities Commission has any oath bound nor civil authority to obstruct a minister from performing the functions of his calling nor to determine the functions of his calling unless damage has ensued to man, woman or property violating God's law as complained of by an opposing man or woman.

165. It is agreed by Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that no oath bound sanctioned honour lies in the unlawful private action of intimidating, obstructing and acting as a nuisance to a legitimate and sincere minister of Christ officially performing the noticed non commercial functions of his calling.

166. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that any man or woman who has sworn an oath to the Christian Monarch to be truly allegiant to the "Defender of the faith", then obstructs, intimidates or acts as a nuisance to the ability of an officiating minister of God, has acted against the Queens ability to defend the faith and is attempting to overthrow her majesty's government, being the King James Bible, by force….and that Section 46 of the criminal code applies to all sworn allegiant officers of her majesty.

It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the “Rule of law” spoken of in the preamble to the 1982 de facto Constitution, being a rule for debtors,(that clearly only applies to all registered corporate government employee’s via section 32 of that charter), is indisputably God’s law, being the King James Bible, as defended by the Christian monarch that you the private woman swore to be truly allegiant to via the Canadian oaths of Allegiance Act and Coronation Act of 1689. Any other act that dares speak contrary or may have altered the authorized form such as removing the word “do” are not withstanding or legitimate.

It is very important that I show you why I can not allow any one to assume that they have any power or force over me. To be definitive, TDW need to see the lawful definition of person and the scriptures that guide me and command me to not show respect to persons, as they are fictions of law. A player on a stage wearing a mask.

PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl.

Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164.

But when the word “Persons” is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 1 Scam. R.178.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. Women cannot be appointed to any public office, nor perform any civil functions, except those which the law specially declares them capable of exercising. Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25.

They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. 1 Bay, 358. Vide Man.

Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.

TO PERSONATE, crim. law. The act of assuming the character of another without lawful authority, and, in such character, doing something to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent.

The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such. 2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

By the act of congress of the 30th April, 1790, s. 15, 1 Story's Laws U. S. 86, it is enacted, that " if any person shall acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged in any court of Canada, any recognizance, bail or judgement, in the name or names of any other person or persons not privy or consenting to the same, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeds five thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding seven years, and whipped not exceeding thirty-nine stripes, Provided nevertheless. that this act shall not extend to the acknowledgment of any judgement or judgements by any attorney or attorneys, duly admitted, for any person or persons against whom any such judgement or judgements shall be bad or given." Vide, generally, 2 John. Cas. 293; 16 Vin. Ab. 336; Com. Dig. Action on the case for a deceit, A 3.

James 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one [point], he is guilty of all.

Here is a list of more in-depth definitions so no one gets lost.

I am not a Person, or an Individual, or even a human, Manuel, but before you think I am crazy, examine the facts.

I am not a person, or an individual, or a Human, and although some humans look similar to me, I am not a human.

Some would say that I am a 'natural' person, but as I will show you, I am not one of those either. Who then or what then, am I?

To understand who I am, you must first understand the definitions which have been placed on the words I have quoted above, words that are commonly used, but do not describe me anymore. For example, the word 'person'.

Person – The Revised Code of Washington, RCW 1.16.080, (I live in Washington State) defines a person as follows: “The term ‘person’ may be construed to include the United States, this state, or any state or territory, or any public or private corporation, as well as an individual.”

Person – Black’s Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 791, defines ‘person’ as follows: “In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Person – Oran’s Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999, defines

Person as: 1. A human being (a “natural” person). 2. A corporation (an “artificial” person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word “person” includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other “being” entitled to sue as a legal entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4.. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word).

Person – Duhaime’s Law Dictionary. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are “persons” in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to “persons”, which in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations.

Person, noun. person. – Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Defines personas: [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.]

legal person – Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law 1996, defines a legal person as : a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued.

A person according to these definitions, is basically an entity – legal fiction – of some kind that has been legally created and has the legal capacity to be sued. Isn’t it odd that the word lawful is not used within these definitions? Well then…. I am not “the United States, this state, or any territory, or any public or private corporation”. I am not “labour organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” So, I cannot be a ‘person’ under this part of the definition.

The RCW quoted above also states that a person could also be an “individual”. Black’s Law Dictionary also defines a person as a “human being,” which they define by stating “(i.e. natural person)”. So, let’s first check to see if I am an “individual”.

Individual – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg. 533, defines

"individual" as follows: "As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons."

Well now, I have already been shown that I am not a 'person', and since

'individual' denotes a single 'person' as distinguished from a group or class, I can't be an 'individual' under this definition either. But I see the term 'natural person' used in the definition of the RCW, and also in the definition of some of the Law Dictionaries. Maybe I am a 'natural' person, since I know I am not an 'artificial' one.

I could not find the term 'Natural person' defined anywhere, so I had to look up the word 'natural' for a definition to see if that word would fit with the word person…

Natural – Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition, pg.712, defines 'Natural' as follows: "Untouched by man or by influences of civilization; wild; untutored, and is the opposite of the word "artificial". The juristic meaning of this term does not differ from the vernacular, except in the cases where it is used in opposition to the term "legal"; and then it means proceeding from or determined by physical causes or conditions, as distinguished from positive enactments of law, or attributable to the nature of man rather than the commands of law, or based upon moral rather than legal considerations or sanctions."

Hmmm, what do they mean by this definition? Am I untouched by man (depends on what the word 'man' means), or by influences of civilization? I don't think so. Am I 'wild', or 'untutored'? (Buzzer sound), not me. Even though the definition states that this word is the opposite of the word 'artificial', it still does not describe who I believe I am. So, I must conclude that I am not a 'natural' person, under this definition of the word 'natural'. So, the term 'natural person' cannot apply to me.

Black's Law Dictionary also used the term 'human being', and although Black's defined it as a 'natural person', maybe they made a mistake, maybe I am a 'human being'. 'Human' or 'human being' does not appear to have a 'legal' definition, so I went to my old standby 1888 Noah Webster's Dictionary for a vernacular definition of this word. Maybe Noah would know who I am

Human – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'human' as follows: n. A human being; one of the race of man. [Rare and inelegant.] "Sprung of humans that inhabit earth." …To me, the etymology of the word Hu-man, suggests that it is a marriage of two separate words 'Hue' (defined as the property of color), and man. But this cannot, of course, be correct, at least not politically correct, so I can't go there, because the word would then mean 'coloured man'!

Am I of the race of man? Rare and inelegant? Sprung of humans that inhabit earth (ground)? (I'm not coloured either). Well, it looks like I have to define the word 'man' through Webster's because there appears to be no legal definition for 'man'.

Man – Webster's 1888 Dictionary defines 'man' as follows: An individual of the human race; a human being; a person.

Great news!!, it looks like we are back to the beginning of our study of definitions, yup, back to the start, completed the circle. I am not an 'individual', so I cannot be considered 'of the human race'; and since I'm not of the human race, I can't be 'a human being', and I've also been shown that I'm not a 'person' either.

Now let us see what the word Human really means……I am going into detail so TDW can see we have been deceived by the misuse of our own language.

Definition of Human Being

Are you a 'person', an 'individual', or a 'human being'? These words, at law, define you as being spiritually 'dead.' This is how the world makes its attachment to you. The terms, 'person', 'individual', 'human being', etc., are not in Christ. Words like "individual," and "human being" do not even appear in Scripture! These are 'created' terms by the natural man (1 Cor 2:14). These words describe the 'old man', but not the 'new man' in Christ (Col 3:9-10). In Balantine's Self Pronouncing Law Dictionary, 1948, page 389, Human

Being is defined as "See Monster." On page 540 of this same Law Dictionary, Monster is defined as "a human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, pages 879- 880, a Monster is defined as "a person so cruel, wicked, depraved, etc., as to horrify others." From the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd Edition, page 901, Human Being is defined as a "Natural man: unenlightened or unregenerate," and on page 1461, Unregenerate means "not regenerate; unrepentant; an unregenerate sinner; not convinced by or unconverted to a particular religion; wicked, sinful, dissolute."

In Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988, page 657, Humanitarianism is defined as "the doctrine that humankind may become perfect without divine aid."

In Colliers New Dictionary of the English Language, 1928, Humanitarian is defined as "a philanthropist; an anti-Trinitarian who rejects the doctrine of Christ's divinity; a perfectionist."

And in the Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1990, page 653, Humanism is defined as "any system or mode of thought or action in which human interests, values and dignity predominate, especially an ethical theory that often rejects the importance of a belief in God."

Therefore, when anyone calls himself or herself a 'human being', or a 'humanitarian,' they are saying (according to every definition of these words, and according to the law), "I'm an animal; I'm a monster; I'm not saved; I'm unrepentant; I'm an unregenerate sinner; I'm not converted; I'm wicked, sinful, and dissolute; I'm cruel, depraved, unenlightened; and I reject Christ's divinity and the importance of a belief in God."

a. "Men [Bondman] rely for protection of their right on God's law, and not upon regulations and proclamations of departments of government, or officers who have been designated to carry laws into effect." Baty v. Sale, 43 Ill. 351." [Codes, edicts, proclamations, and decisions are not Law, which define or regulate the Good and Lawful Bondman. Therefore, "law" suits are ungodly, and are the redress for and of human beings, i.e., non-believers.]

The Septuagint uses the term "human beings" only one time, and its meaning is identical to the above definitions. Let's look at the last verse of the book of Jonah, where Nineva was full of men who were unrepentant, unregenerate, unconverted, wicked, sinful, dissolute, cruel, depraved, unenlightened, rejected the importance of a belief in God. Or, in other words, "human beings."

"And shall not I spare Nineve, the great city, in which dwell more than twelve myriads of human beings, who do not know their right hand or their left hand…?" [Jonah 4:11 (Septuagint)]

The "human beings" of Nineve did not know their right hand from their left because they did not know the Truth and were lost. They did not know God; they were separated from God. However, those human beings were willing to turn from their ways and learn the things of God, so He spared that city from destruction.

b. The term "human being" is also synonymous with the term 'natural man.'

c. "The natural man is a spiritual monster. His heart is where his feet should be, fixed upon the earth; his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on. His face is towards hell, his back towards heaven. He loves what he should hate and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for and mourns for what he ought to rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor." [Thomas Boston, quoted in Augustus Top lady, Complete Works (1794, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications 1987), page 584].

And the Word confirms: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1 Corinthians 2:14,]

The above verse witnesses to us that the natural man is spiritually dead. The 'natural man' in Scripture is synonymous with the 'natural person' as defined in man's laws.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 361.

Natural Person: Any human being who as such is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. Natural Child: The ordinary euphemism for 'bastard' or illegitimate." [Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y . 395, 73 N.E.2d 716." Max Radin, Radin's Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.]

Those that are spiritually dead belong to the prince of this world because he's dead himself. Satan has dominion over the natural man, for he is the prince of this world [John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11]; and, because of this, he has dominion over those of the world, i.e., human beings, the natural man – those who receive not the things of the Spirit of God and reject Christ. Because the bondman in Christ is sanctified from the world, he is separated from the adversary's dominion over him–sin [John 8:34].. This is the cause for Christ having sanctified Himself in the Truth of the Word of God – to provide the entrance to the refuge in and through Himself for us. I could provide you more, Manuel, and I do sincerely thank you for your focused attention to this, my honest effort at officially performing the function of my calling in establishing this agreement with you as per Matthew 5:25 and 18:15-20, but I think you are already overwhelmed as I have, upon presentation of facts, destroyed your belief system and now you are aware you are working for a massive criminal organization founded upon a false oath. Can you now see why I must not allow my name to be altered? Remember, every one of the officers of Alberta has a false oath…What kind of authority swears an oath that is bogus??? A false authority!

167. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man, with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that the document titled "Equitable Solution for Forensic Audit of Cestui Que Trust with Interest Calculation," dated April 22, 2025, addressed to the Judge Advocate General of the Canadian Armed Forces and copied to the RCMP, INTERPOL, Federal Court of Canada, and the UN Human Rights Committee, is hereby incorporated into this Agreement by reference. This letter forms an integral and enforceable part of this Agreement, outlining the factual basis, legal claims, and equitable remedies sought concerning the systemic fraud involving my Cestui Que Trust. Its contents, including but not limited to the demand for a forensic audit, restitution calculations, and references to international covenants such as the ICCPR and ICESCR, are acknowledged and agreed upon as binding terms within this Agreement.The incorporation of this letter ensures that all obligations, acknowledgments, and remedies detailed therein are enforceable under the terms of this Agreement, and any breach of these provisions shall constitute a breach of this Agreement. You consent that his document is available by request or PDF at; https://www.td-lied.com/

168. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that It is agreed with no dispute to the fact by you forthcoming that you are aware that I reserve my right under God's law not to be compelled to perform under any fraudulently obtained contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, with

informed consent, voluntarily and intentionally. Relevant maxims: He who seeks equity must do equity and Qui tacet consentire videtur" (Silence implies consent).

169. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; This private agreement is issued in truth and good faith. If no written, witnessed objection is received within 30 calendar days of delivery, the terms herein shall be deemed accepted in full, and the parties agree that such acceptance is valid in both law and equity, as supported by Ezekiel 33:6 and Ecclesiastes 5:4–6. Silence or non-response shall constitute lawful acquiescence and willful agreement.

170. It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you; Failure to cure any breach within 30 calendar days of written notice shall constitute consent to immediate escalation to a court or forum of my choosing, including courts of equity, conscience, or international jurisdiction, at my sole discretion and benefit.

171. It is agreed by Margaretdawn Anderson, the private man with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you forthcoming from you, that it is agreed by you with no dispute to the fact forthcoming from you, that you are aware that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed de facto contract or unlawful commercial agreement, which is my ministerial duty pursuant to God's law to divide myself from.

Conversion Torts; The unlawful turning or applying the personal goods of another to the use of the taker, or of some other person than the owner; or the unlawful destroying or altering their nature.

When a party takes away or wrongfully assumes the right to goods which belong to another, it will in general be sufficient evidence of a conversion but when the original taking was lawful, as when the party found the goods, and the detention only is illegal, it is absolutely necessary to make a demand of the goods, and there must be a refusal to deliver them before the conversion will be complete. The refusal by a servant to deliver the goods entrusted to him by his master is not evidence of a conversion by his master. Leviticus 6:2-5 The tortious taking of property is, of itself, a conversion and any intermeddling with it, or any exercise of dominion over it, subversive of the dominion of the owner or the nature of the bailment if it be bailed, is evidence of a conversion.

In Equity, the considering of one thing as changed into another; for example, land will be considered as converted into money and treated as such by a court of equity, when the owner has contracted to sell his estate, in which case, if he die before the conveyance, his executors and not his heirs will be entitled to the money. On the other hand, money is converted into land in a variety of ways as for example, when a man agrees to buy land and dies before he has received the conveyance, the money he was to pay for it will be considered as converted into lands and descend to the heir.

It is agreed upon by you, Margaretdawn Anderson, having no dispute to the following fact forthcoming from you; that you the private man are aware and agree that I am a flesh bone blood living man, being God's minister, and that I cannot possibly have been in a dead legal corporate fiction called the Province of Ontario, Canada or other as the Province of Ontario, Canada and other is not a place but a dead corporate fiction of law on paper created for the purpose of extracting money from me in fraud as it is

totally against my will, conscience and a violation of my faith to submit to and is being done without my informed consent or cognisant permission for a financial gain.

It is agreed by you, Margaretdawn Anderson with full understanding, that failure to refute or disprove the facts provided above, as agreed upon by you, I am advised by

Christ at Matthew 18:15-20 to gain a simple agreement with you privately and very simply as a child so I would like your aid in agreeing with me that respecting persons written as persona in the Latin vulgate is sin and disrespected by God. Due to the emergent nature of this agreement you are required to respond to this agreement within 10 (ten) days of receipt representing fairness, truth, natural equity. Failure to respond will be deemed acceptance of the terms, including acknowledgment of all outlined facts and obligations. We can see that in Deuteronomy 1:17. 10:17, 2nd Samuel 14:14, Matthew 22:16. Acts 10:34, Romans 2:11, James 2:1-9 and 1st Peter 1:17. If you have no dispute with that scriptural fact I will confirm with witnesses then post our good faith agreement in a paper.

Thankyou for you aid in saving my faith harmless from assumption.

Ecclesiastically Autographed non commercial as: minister Richard, a minister of Christ, officially performing a function of my ministry.

< minister Richard >

<electronic mark>

minister Richard Henry

Jhon 15:16

Please do take notice that I, minister Richard, do not make use of birth dates and/or surnames outside of being born again in the holy name, blood, and water of Christ Jesus; my risen Savior Yahushewah Messiah. Also, please feel free to write me if you'd like to know more about my King, Christ Jesus; keeping in mind that your Christian Monarch also serves my King, and I shall share with TDW my 1611 A.D. King James Holy Bible.

-Blessings!